

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1883.

The Week.

THE rule by which the House of Representatives is to be kept from adopting the Senate Tariff Bill as it stands, and the adoption of which was, on Monday, prevented by the breaking of the quorum, but which was carried on Tuesday, is a great curiosity. It provides "that during the remainder of this session it shall be in order at any time to move to suspend the rules, which motion shall be decided by a majority vote, to take from the Speaker's table House bill 5,533, with Senate amendments thereto (being the so-called Senate Tariff Bill), and to declare a disagreement with the Senate's amendments to the same, and to ask for a committee of conference thereon, to be composed of five members on the part of the House." In other words, the Senate Tariff Bill may be taken up for the purpose of disagreeing with it and of sending it to a conference committee, but not for the purpose of adopting it. This is probably the first time in parliamentary history that a rule was made for a legislative body, permitting the latter to take up a certain subject for action, but providing at the same time that this action shall be in one way and not in another. The "protected interests" are evidently at their wits' ends. But the race of those who have to resort to such tricks is usually not a long one.

In the Senate on Monday Mr. Van Wyck called up his resolution requesting the President to communicate any information in his possession touching the alleged agreement of the Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy at Lima to make a joint effort to bring about peace between Chili and Peru, and to inform the Senate whether the Minister of the United States had been instructed to accept the mediation of the Ministers of European Powers in settling the troubles. The resolution was adopted without dissent, but Mr. Van Wyck made some remarks in support of it, relating to Mr. Trescott's mission, which are important if true. He declared that Mr. Trescott was prevented from making peace between Chili and Peru by the Administration. "Just as Mr. Trescott was about to make the proper representations to the Government of Chili," he says, "he was stopped by a cable despatch from Secretary Frelinghuysen," and "was informed that any intervention in the affairs of other nations was against the policy of the United States; substantially, that murder, massacre, and destruction of trade might go unchecked between two independent republics so far as the United States were concerned." We do not remember seeing this despatch. If the Administration was so bloody-minded then, why has it become so pacific all of a sudden? Our impression always was that Mr. Trescott failed to make peace because Chili and Peru could not come to terms.

The appointment of Mr. John W. Foster to the Spanish mission is reported to have been entirely unsolicited by him as well as by his Indiana friends. This is very creditable to the Administration. Mr. Foster has served as Minister of the United States to Mexico and to Russia, and has on all occasions shown not only that fidelity to duty which must be expected of every officer of the Government, but peculiar aptness for diplomatic business. As Mr. Foster also speaks the language of the country to which he is sent, his appointment may be called emphatically one made "in the interest of the public service."

There is little probability that the new and somewhat disguised form of steamship subsidy engrafted upon the Shipping Bill in the Senate will become a law, and there is some probability that it may operate to kill the whole bill. The House has shown such decided hostility to any kind of subsidy that its concurrence in a bill to give a bonus of one dollar per mile (or \$3,000 for each trip across the Atlantic) to pay shipbuilders, not for carrying the mails, but for carrying the American flag, is not to be expected. The legislation to be saved or lost this week is so vast in amount, embracing several appropriation bills, the Tax and Tariff Bill, the Court of Appeals Bill, the Bonded Whiskey Bill, etc., that any bill of secondary importance which requires much circulation back and forth between the two houses is very likely to fail.

There has been a series of rather important failures in the West, in the last ten days, beginning with that of John V. Ayer's Sons in the iron trade at Chicago, and including that of W. T. Allen & Co., grocers, and the large paper-manufacturing firm of Lucius Fairchild & Co., at South Bend, Indiana, besides a good many smaller ones. The effect of these was to give a downward turn to all the speculative markets in grain and provisions, which has continued throughout the time mentioned. General trade in the West has also been interrupted to a very considerable extent by the floods in the rivers in the central region, and by heavy snows in northwestern Iowa and southwestern Minnesota. There are even apprehensions of still greater damage along the Lower Mississippi, when the accumulated floods of the Ohio and other Northern rivers shall reach there. To these add fears of disturbances in prices by the passage of the Tariff and Revenue Bill by Congress. All these circumstances have combined to depress business generally. Money has continued abundant, but with a hardening tendency, during the last week. The movements of capital between the United States and Europe are less marked than a few weeks ago. The total weekly value of our exports of domestic products has diminished in the past ten days, and yet foreign exchange has declined. It is believed that foreign capital is now taking more of our railway securities than a couple of weeks ago; prices of

stocks having declined to a point where many conservative capitalists both in Europe and this country believe they are safe to buy if a fair degree of discrimination is exercised in the purchases. As the earnings of the railroads are unusually large, and the present range of prices is from 15 to 20 per cent. below those of a year or eighteen months ago, there seems much ground for this opinion. Of course a great deal depends upon the prospects of the next grain crop, about which, of course, nothing positive can be said for at least six weeks yet.

The *Christian Advocate* has published a defence and explanation of its share in puffing the swindle which has become known to the public during the last week or two as "the Methodist Mine." It says, in substance, that the swindling owner of the mine, a man named Bixby, hit on the device of getting Dr. Spencer, the President of a struggling "Wesleyan University" in East Tennessee, to believe that he was going to endow the University with 15,000 shares of his stock, and persuaded him that it was very valuable. The President sent out a professor to examine it, but whether the professor had ever seen a mine before does not appear. The professor reported that it was a very fine mine indeed. Thereupon the unhappy President started for the North to puff the stock, in order to enable the owner to get some money to "develop the property." He saw the editors of the *Advocate*, who knew no more about mines than he did, and told them a wonderful tale. "The gleam of confidence in his eye," they say, "the smile of serene anticipation on his lips," deceived them, and they wrote a gorgeous puff of the mine, enabling the swindling owner to "unload" on a considerable number of simple-minded Methodists. They are now very sorry, and confess they did wrong: probably all the sorer because, if we understand their statement rightly, they went in themselves on "the ground floor."

This would be, perhaps, a sufficient excuse but for two things. One is that although it may be proper to invest your own money on the strength of a "gleam of confidence in the eye," or a "smile of anticipation on the lips" of somebody else, it is not right to persuade other people to do so for any purpose, not even to endow a "University." This is a lesson of which everybody has had plenty of experience during the last twenty years. The other is that it is well known that religious newspapers are a favorite medium for swindlers and charlatans desirous of getting rid of worthless stocks. For some years after the war they were the chief agents in promoting the sale of good-for-nothing railroad securities, to the great scandal and loss of the religious world. The editors of the *Advocate* ought not, therefore, to have been taken unawares when Dr. Spence came gleaming and smiling into their office. They ought to have met him with the unalterable rule that no journal, and above all no religious journal,

ought to recommend an investment under any circumstances or for any purpose. It is not the business of a newspaper, or one for which any editor is fit. If there be no canon of the Methodist discipline forbidding stock-puffing by newspapers, one ought to be promptly adopted, and it ought to operate whether the stock turns out well or ill.

The demand which is now said to have been made on our Government for the extradition of P. J. Sheridan, who is accused by Carey, the informer, of having been actively engaged in organizing the Assassination Society in Dublin, is likely to lead to some troublesome controversy; but it seems hardly probable that the British Government will press it vigorously. Whether an offence is political depends on the motives of the offender, to be inferred from the surrounding circumstances. If it is obviously an expression of political hatred or discontent, and is committed on a political officer or agent, either in revenge for political wrongs or with the view of bringing about a political change, it is a political offence, however atrocious or repulsive or futile. And the reasons why free governments are unwilling to surrender persons to take their trial at home for such offences are obvious enough. The first is, that political offences almost always—like that greatest of them all, armed rebellion—arise out of domestic discontents or dissensions, on the reasonableness or justice of which a foreign government is not competent to pass. The second is, that while as regards ordinary crimes the supreme government of every country stands aside as an almost impartial spectator, indifferent to the decisions of the tribunals, as regards political crimes it is an eager and interested, and often fiercely interested, party to the prosecution, and is likely to use all its influence and all its power to bring about a conviction. Consequently, the chances of a fair trial for political offences are in every country smaller than for any other offence, and no government which is asked to surrender a refugee likes to be very nice in drawing the line between them and ordinary offences. In fact, the rule which governs most such cases was very neatly laid down by Lord Palmerston when he said that "the British Government had never undertaken to provide for the internal security of other countries. It is sufficient to them to have the power to provide for the internal security of their own." There is nothing in all this, however, to lessen the joy with which all civilized men will hear that everybody connected, nearly or remotely, with the Phoenix Park murders has been strung up.

Dr. Dix, of Trinity Church, is delivering a course of lectures on the "Calling of the Christian Woman," in one of which he recently fell foul of what is called the "higher education," which Columbia College is now being asked to provide for in this city. We are a little reluctant to comment on the newspaper reports of what he said, knowing how often sermons and lectures are travestied or perverted in the newspaper summaries of them; and in his behalf we must express a doubt whether he really said that the term—

"Higher education of women suggests the question, Higher than what? higher than whose? higher than that of men or higher than women receive at present? The term clearly masks a sinister purpose and covers a theory of woman's education against which I enter a solemn and permanent protest. These advocates demand an education for women on the same line with that of men; training them to think men's thoughts, to do men's work. This is plainly intended, for it is coupled with another demand for co-education. That means that the youth of both sexes should be taught the same things, in the same places, and out of the same books, and by the same teachers, and in company of each other. It is well known that pressure has been brought to bear upon the trustees of Columbia College to coax or tease or frighten them into an adoption of this policy. It appears, then, that these advocates of a higher education are driving at co-education, and under this term aim at treating girls as if they were boys, as essentially the same thing, and training them all together, and that the woman shall have the same training as the man."

We express a doubt whether he said all this, because it is both sophistical and obscure. There is no such want of clearness in the term higher education as he seems to discover; in fact, no more than in the term "higher mathematics," or "high school," or "higher classes." When any one talks to Dr. Dix of the "higher mathematics" he does not answer, "Higher than what? higher than whose? Why are mathematics high? Why not low? What are your real designs in using this strange phrase?" When one speaks to him of a "high school," he does not say, "Ha, ha! I see what you are up to. Why should a school be high? Why not low or medium? Do you mean as high as Trinity Church steeple, or as high as the Capitol dome at Washington? If so, why should a school be so high? Answer me that, or for ever hold your peace." The higher education of women is really, we assure Dr. Dix, a perfectly harmless and well-known term, in long use both in England and this country. It masks no nefarious design against the female character, or the true dignity of womanhood, or the peace of homes. It means simply what is known among men as more advanced education than is given at primary schools to children. It means what a young woman would do who, at sixteen or seventeen, instead of giving herself up to dancing, flirting, or even wholly to church work, should continue the studies which she has been carrying on at school or under a home governess. It means, in fact—we blush to write it—more history, more geography, more French and German, and more philosophy than she has had while her skirts only came to her ankles; to be acquired in a room with benches, from teachers called "professors." The theory on which it is asked for is not that woman ought to do man's work, as Dr. Dix supposes, but that a little more knowledge than she now gets will fit her better to do her own work. We will even be so cruel as to add that we think Dr. Dix's reasoning processes, if correctly reported, would inevitably be improved if his female audiences had had a little training in elementary logic.

The convicts in the Penitentiary at Jefferson City, Missouri, mutinied on Friday, under the lead of a Mr. John B. Johnson, a "safe-blower" by profession, who was serving out a twelve years' sentence for highway robbery. He set fire to the buildings, and though the revolt was

put down, the losses by fire are very heavy. The ringleaders embraced also Mr. J. S. Johnson, a murderer, Mr. Perry Martin, a stage robber, and Mr. "Arkansas" Williams, a convict of experience, who got up a revolt in the Kansas City Jail last spring. The despatches mention that they are all "desperate men," and there is nothing in the account given of their proceedings on this occasion, or in what we know of their previous lives, to throw any doubt upon the statement. No explanation is given of the revolt, except the mutineers' simple, honest dislike of prison life. Strange to say, no public sympathy is expressed for any of the gallant fellows, and no enthusiasm displayed over their heroism, which, in view of the hold that Jesse James has taken upon the public heart, and the respect and consideration with which he has been treated, must seem rather hard to them. Mr. Martin, for instance, who last summer carried things with as high a hand in southwestern Missouri as James himself ever did, and "held up" several stageloads of passengers between Seligman and Eureka Springs, must feel that, if James was a hero, he was on the way to become one.

The correspondence between the Secretary of the Navy and Commander Gorringer is probably unique. The naval archives either of this or any other country certainly cannot show its match. Something of the kind, however, was sure to happen when Mr. Chandler took possession of the Navy Department. To politicians of his type, officers of Mr. Gorringer's kind, who have scientific and literary or economical interests, are simply incomprehensible. In the world in which Mr. Chandler has passed his life as plain "Bill Chandler" there were no such persons, and he does not see how they can exist in the new and strange world in which he now lives in the extremely grotesque character of an admiral in command of a small fleet. In old times, whenever any of Mr. Chandler's companions advocated anything, or discussed anything of a public nature, he always understood that they were doing it because they had "an axe to grind," or had their eye on an office, or wished to "knife" or "slaughter" somebody, or get even with somebody. In those circles the notion that a man's public talk is simply the expression of his private sentiments, would afford food for much mirth. When Mr. Chandler, therefore, saw that Commander Gorringer had been reported, in an interview in the *Evening Post*, as advocating "free ships," it seemed to him so natural that he should have been paid for doing it, that he at once set to work to find out who had paid him, and wrote to him for the purpose in the simple, artless way to which he had been used in his old set. He was probably extremely surprised to find that Commander Gorringer was annoyed by the inquiry. Among "the boys" it would doubtless have been received with perfect good-humor. Mr. Chandler probably to this hour does not see why Commander Gorringer should have got "mad" on being asked whether he, an American naval officer, was not in receipt of British pay, particularly as there was no hint of "divvy" or assessment; or why it

should be considered offensive to suppose that an American gentleman would not talk "free ships" unless he expected a check for it. The most laughable part of the affair is the closing interview with the Secretary, reported by some of the papers, in which he declares that Gorringer is angry, and is "vituperating" him, and that all he had done was to object to the Commander's giving his views on free trade and free ships "in British employ." This is the old Bill Chandler of the stump and the caucus all over. The poet has said, you may break, you may ruin the vase if you will, but the scent of the roses will hang round it still. So, also, you may take a wire-pulling politician, and make him a sailor, or an astronomer, or an anything-you-please, he will always retain his old tricks, and especially that most useful one of putting a new dress on an old lie.

We called attention some time since to a decision of the United States Commissioner at Boston with regard to medical diplomas in that State. The subject having attracted the attention of Dr. H. P. Walcott, of the State Board of Health, he requested an opinion upon it from the Attorney-General. This has now been published, and it is to the effect that corporations organized under the general law of Massachusetts have not, as such, power to confer degrees at all. He founds this conclusion chiefly upon the fact that power to confer degrees has been expressly given by the Legislature to some colleges; in others it has not been given, and it is not a power which an educational institution must possess by its very existence. This opinion, if sustained by the courts, will save Massachusetts from the reproach of encouraging the fraudulent multiplication of degrees. It gives degrees the position they ought to have, of valuable franchises, which nobody can obtain without proving himself fit by his previous study and attainments to employ them properly. It does not, however, meet the whole difficulty of the general cheapening and degradation of degrees. A college degree is of little value in the United States, not merely or chiefly because of the dread of bogus diplomas, but because of the multiplication of institutions with the power of conferring real degrees. It would be a great mistake, no doubt, if any seven persons possessed, in Massachusetts or elsewhere, the power of vesting themselves with the right to give degrees; but as a general rule the right can be obtained from most of our legislatures if there is any pretence of founding a college or professional school, on however flimsy a basis. The degrees issued by these institutions generally help a young man to the practice of medicine or law, and how many hundreds of them there are in the United States we have no means of knowing. There are in this State four or five law schools which stand on the same footing before the law with Columbia and Harvard, and the same thing is true all over the country.

The Buffalo *Express*, in its waggish way, undertakes to make fun of our exposure of the abuses connected with bouquets, and couples us in its ridicule with the Boston *Advertiser*, and the dastardly attack made in

the columns of that paper on the crush hat. If the *Express* had followed the matter with the care it merits, it would know that we have completely demolished the position taken by the *Advertiser* on the crush hat, and proved that in attacking the hat it has shown its complete incompetence for the task of social reform. The *Express* satirically reminds us that the Constitution of the United States makes no provision for the settlement of social questions of the sort that we have been discussing. It thinks that in "the earlier and simpler days of the Republic" the fathers supposed that "all social questions could be safely left to custom," but adds that with the frivolity of the present day the conflicts between fashion and economy require something more than custom for their settlement, and therefore suggests the creation of a "court" in which such matters may be judicially decided. This flippancy may do very well for Buffalo, but we can assure the *Express* that society in New York is no laughing matter. We shall not be deterred by ridicule from going on with our work, in which we are daily receiving assurances of the support and esteem of our best society.

The collapse of another clerical savings bank in the Roman Catholic Church, this time in Massachusetts, for a large amount, it is to be hoped will at last put poor depositors on their guard against this most dangerous and unbusinesslike way of disposing of their money. Considering the success of Mrs. Howe's bank of deposit among the native American women in Boston, we ought not to speak severely of the financial ignorance and credulity of the poor Irish who expect priests to do one of the most difficult things in this age and country—invest other people's money with safety and profit. The most experienced and honest financiers find it very hard to do it; it is folly to expect clergymen to do it. As a matter of fact, however, neither the Augustinian Fathers in Massachusetts, nor Archbishop Purcell in Ohio, made any pretence of investing the money of the depositors in a business way. They seem to have used it without stint or restraint in church building and other ecclesiastical uses, and trusted to luck and the usual annual voluntary contributions for church purposes to enable them to pay interest or principal when called upon; and now that the system has broken down, all they can say to the depositors is that with time they will pay "dollar for dollar." The extraordinary performance among the Methodists known as "the Methodist Mine," in which some of the clergy and the denominational organ got a large number of the faithful into the stock of a worthless mine, with which the knavish and waggish owner declared he was going to endow a theological seminary, must, however, prevent Protestants from criticising the financial troubles of the Roman Catholics with asperity. We think, on the whole, there is not much to choose between the position of an Augustinian Father with a broken bank on his hands, and that of the clerical occupant of the "ground floor" of a "busted" religious mine.

The savage attack of Mr. Forster on Mr. Parnell in the House of Commons, has a very

unpleasant resemblance to the mode in which Sir William Harcourt used to "draw" the Irishmen in the House during the passage of the Coercion Bill, by lashing them into fury by jibes and insults, and then getting them suspended, or reprobated for disorder. One member, O'Kelly, who pocketed so much of the "Skirmishing Fund" in this city, fell into the trap, and, giving Mr. Forster the "lie," has been suspended for his pains. Parnell, though ferociously denounced as an instigator of the assassins, kept cool, and took no notice, evidently to the great irritation of the majority in the House, who wanted him to get up that they might bait him. Mr. Forster's main argument would be reprehensibly absurd if it had not been produced by a very angry man. It was, in effect that he was justified in putting Parnell in jail because it is now proved that some of the Land Leaguers were concerned in the assassinations, and because they used some of the funds of the League in preparing the assassination, and because Parnell probably knew or suspected all this. Unfortunately, Mr. Forster made no pretence when he locked Parnell up of suspecting anything of the kind. What he said was that Parnell's language, even if innocent in itself, instigated others to violence, and that his influence was generally pernicious. Ex post facto justification is no more allowable than ex post facto legislation.

The Parnell reply has been received with much dissatisfaction by the English press, not apparently because anybody really believes he had any connection with or knowledge of the Dublin assassinations, but because he was not sufficiently repentant and submissive under Forster's attack, which seems hardly to have been of the kind, however, to make a man amiable and conciliatory. In fact, it was highly disorderly, and probably would not have been permitted toward an English member. It is against the rules of the House to accuse a man in debate of a disgraceful offence. Why O'Kelly should have been suspended for telling Forster that he lied, when Forster was allowed to tell Parnell that he had had a hand in a murder, it is hard to see. Of the performance on both sides, however, it may be said that it was magnificent, but not war. The impolicy of Mr. Forster's denunciations need hardly be pointed out. They may make Mr. Forster feel easier, but they do not help to solve the Irish problem. Abuse of Parnell from that quarter does not damage him with any one who does not hate him already. It unquestionably endears him to the Irish voters, and the Irish problem consists almost wholly in conciliating the Irish voters, and in getting them not to mind Parnell. Since this speech they will probably mind him more than ever. In fact, it may be considered fuel for the flame of agitation. The best way to undermine Parnell's influence is to go to work to redress the Irish grievances—whatever they be—of which Mr. Forster, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Courtney, and the Marquis of Hartington have all within the last month acknowledged the existence. In the game of vituperation the Irish are fully Mr. Forster's match, and nothing can come of it but bitterness.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

(WEDNESDAY, February 21, to TUESDAY, February 28, 1883, inclusive.)

DOMESTIC.

On Wednesday the Senate passed the Army and Fortification Appropriation Bills, and the joint resolution to provide for the termination of the articles of the Treaty of Washington relating to the fisheries, and took up the Rebate Bill. On Thursday the Naval Appropriation Bill was under consideration. The amendment of the Committee making the appropriation "for engines and machinery for the double-turreted iron clads, in accordance with the recommendation of the Naval Advisory Board," was agreed to. On Friday the bill was passed and the Rebate Bill taken up. On Saturday the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Bill was passed. On Monday the House Bill to prevent the importation of adulterated and spurious teas was called up and passed as was also a resolution requesting the President to communicate any information in his possession touching the alleged agreement of the Ministers of Great Britain, France, and Italy at Lima to make a joint effort to bring about peace between Chili and Peru, and to inform the Senate whether the Minister of the United States had been instructed to accept the mediation of the Ministers of European Powers in settling a purely American question. On Tuesday, Secretary Frelinghuysen reported that Minister Partridge had been censured for his unauthorized action in the premises, and that foreign Governments had been notified accordingly.

The Republican Representatives held a caucus on Thursday on the Tariff Bill. The whole situation was freely discussed, the result being the adoption of a resolution declaring it to be the opinion of the caucus that the Republican members of the House should vote to non-concur in the Senate amendments to the House Revenue Bill, alias the Senate Tariff Bill.

In the House, on Wednesday, the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill being under discussion, Mr. Beltzhoover made an attack upon the administration of the Signal Service under General Hazen. On Thursday an amendment was passed repealing the preemption laws, together with all laws authorizing the filing of declaratory statements for the entry of public lands by agent or attorney. On Friday an amendment relating to the Yellowstone National Park, prohibiting the Secretary of the Interior from leasing any portion of the Park to any person or corporation for any purposes whatever, declaring of no force or effect any lease, agreement, exclusive privilege, or monopoly already granted, and authorizing the Secretary of War to detail troops to prevent trespassing upon the Park, was adopted. On Saturday the bill was passed. On Monday an attempt was made to send the Senate Tariff Bill to a conference committee, but it was defeated, and the joint resolution providing for the termination of the fisheries treaties under the Treaty of Washington was passed. On Tuesday the House voted to take the Tariff Bill from the table and send it to a committee of conference. The Senate agreed to a conference, and both houses appointed conferees. At the opening of the Senate on Tuesday, Senator Davis gave notice of his intention to resign the office of President of that body on the 3d of March.

Petitions bearing the signatures of Albert Bierstadt, Frederick E. Church, A. F. Tait, Wyatt Eaton, President of the Society of American Artists, and hundreds of other artists and sculptors were presented by Representative Belmont, of New York, on Monday, urging the passage of his bill, now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means, which provides for the free importation of works of art.

On Saturday the President nominated Mr. John W. Foster, of Indiana, as Minister to Madrid. The nomination is said to have been

made with special reference to the naturalization and other questions pending between Spain and the United States, and the mission is therefore regarded as of a temporary character.

On Monday the President sent the following nominations to the Senate: S. G. W. Benjamin to be Minister Resident and Consul-General of the United States at Teheran, Persia; Wickham Hoffman to be Minister Resident and Consul General of the United States to Denmark; Lucius H. Foote to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Corea; Dwight T. Reed to be Secretary of Legation and Consul-General of the United States at Madrid.

Secretary Frelinghuysen has, upon the application of the British Government, issued a warrant for the arrest of P. J. Sheridan, accused of complicity in the Phoenix Park murders, and it has been placed in the hands of Mr. West, the British Minister. Mr. Sheridan is in New York. In case he is arrested he will be taken before a United States Commissioner, who will decide whether he is subject to extradition under the warrant. Should he decide in the affirmative, the Department of State will issue the necessary papers.

A correspondence between Secretary Chandler and Commander Gorrings, which culminated in the resignation of the latter, was published on Saturday. Last May Mr. Gorrings published in the *North American Review* an article on the Navy, in which some of the recommendations of the Naval Advisory Board, of which Commodore Shufeldt was President, were opposed. Not long after, Mr. Gorrings gave in public his opinion on the proposed abandonment of the Brooklyn Navy-yard, and the Secretary wrote him: "When particular questions of administration are actually pending in the Department, or before Congress, no public expression of opinion thereon by any officer should be made without he first communicates his views to the Department, and receives authority to make them public. You will please hereafter be governed by this rule." Recently, Mr. Gorrings having published his views on free ships in the *Evening Post*, the Secretary wrote to him to inquire whether he was in the employ of interests not American, which inquiry Mr. Gorrings considered an insult, and so resigned, after writing a sharp letter to Mr. Chandler.

A statue of Robert Fulton was placed in the old Hall of Representatives at Washington on Monday, as one of the two statues to be contributed by Pennsylvania. The sculptor is Mr. Howard Roberts.

The Washington Grand Jury on Friday indicted William Knox Brown, one of the jurors in the first Star-Route trial, for having received money to influence his vote. He is said to have sold himself for \$8.

As a result of the investigation begun by the Citizens' Committee of Washington into the operations of the detective corps of that city, the Grand Jury on Monday returned indictments against a number of detectives and ex-detectives and others for receiving stolen goods. One of the men indicted is Arthur B. Williams, counsel for Brady and Dorsey in the pending Star-route trial.

Governor Butler, of Massachusetts, has issued a proclamation appointing Thursday, April 5, a fast day. In conclusion he says: "I do specially exhort the ministers of the Gospel on that day to feed their flocks with the Divine Word, and not to discourse upon political and other secular topics which may divert the serious thoughts of the people from the humble worship of the Father."

The friends of Polk, the Tennessee defaulter, made an offer to the Tennessee Legislature on Wednesday to the following effect: Upon condition that Polk be released, they agree to pay to the State \$175,000 in the currency of the Bank of Tennessee, and \$75,000 in Tennessee bonds upon which are accumulated coupons to the amount of \$33,700, the

balance of the deficit to be paid by the note of Colonel Polk, due in one year from date, secured by a mortgage upon Polk's interest in Mexican mining property.

By Wednesday night the Ohio River at Cincinnati was practically within its banks, having receded eleven and one-half feet from its highest point. There is still a part of the city overflowed, but business has been renewed, and all danger is over. At Louisville also order has been restored in the flooded districts.

The Grand Jury at Milwaukee, on Monday, found an indictment against George Scheller, the barkeeper, who is charged with setting the Newhall House on fire.

In the Missouri State Prison at Jefferson City on Friday the convicts broke out into a revolt. They seized two of their foremen, and Johnson, the ringleader, set the building containing the prison shops on fire. The guards ran in with the hose, which the convicts cut. The fire was not under control until five shops had been completely destroyed. The total loss will reach \$80,000. Four convicts were seriously burned. Johnson, who attempted to kill a convict who refused to assist him in the revolt, was finally captured after he had made several desperate attempts to escape. About 600 convicts will be idle until the shops are rebuilt, which will cause a material reduction in the revenues of the prison.

The savings bank connected with the Augustinian Society of the city of Lawrence, Mass., which controls the leading Roman Catholic churches and parochial schools there, has failed. The actual debt of the society is about \$540,000, of which \$429,900 is due depositors, the majority of whom are mill operatives and working people, many of them unmarried women.

Ex-Secretary Windom, John M. Candler, of Massachusetts, and Harvey Farrington, of New York, as trustees of a projected new Stock Exchange in New York, have sent out circulars inviting subscriptions for seats at \$5,000 each. When 500 seats are sold, a board room will be opened.

On Saturday the White Star steamship *Republic* arrived at New York with the crew of the freight steamer *Glamorgan*, of the Warren Line. She was sighted by the *Republic* on the 16th inst. in a desperate condition, and all of her passengers and crew except seven, who had been lost, were rescued.

FOREIGN.

In the French Chamber of Deputies, on Thursday, Prime Minister Ferry explained the programme of the Ministry, and solicited the confidence of the country. He said the Government's first care would be to satisfy the wish of the Chamber by applying the law of 1834, under which the Princes would be deprived of their military posts. Without infringing upon the essential liberties of the people, the Government demanded that measures be taken against the utterance of seditious cries and against the authors of seditious placards. Reforms were required in the magistracy. A military bill and an habitual-criminals bill were to be introduced. The budget for 1884 would soon be presented. M. Ferry said the Government proposes to facilitate the execution of public works, and to introduce measures looking to the organization of a protectorate in Tunis and the reduction of the expenses of the occupation of that country. The foreign policy of the Government will be peaceful, but not necessarily one of inaction.

On Saturday M. Jolibois, in making an interpellation, denied that the Republic emanated from national sovereignty, as it lacked a plebiscite, and moved that the Chamber desires that the individual liberty of all citizens, without distinction, be respected. The motion was rejected by a vote of 368 to 93. After a prolonged debate a resolution approv-

ing the measures which the Government contemplates against pretenders, was adopted.

Decrees enforcing the law of 1834, depriving Princes of their military posts, have been gazetted in France. They will affect, it is said, neither the Duc de Penthièvre, who is already exempted from service, nor Prince Roland Bonaparte, who is not regarded as a pretender.

The report of General Thibaudin, Minister of War, in justification of the retirement of the Duc d'Aumale, the Duc de Chartres, and the Duc d'Alençon, says public opinion demanded the adoption of a measure placing these Princes on the retired list. The public had become alive to the inconvenience of the presence in the Army of officers belonging to former reigning families. The great principles of subordination and discipline might be weakened thereby.

It is stated that the French Admiral on the Madagascar station has been ordered to suppress vigorously any attempts to resist the rights of France on the island.

Mr. Gladstone arrived in Paris on his way from Cannes to London on Tuesday. He paid a visit to President Grévy and M. Challemlacour.

In the debate on Mr. Gorst's amendment to the address in reply to the Queen's speech—declaring that, in view of the confession of the Irish assassins, no further concessions should be made to lawless agitation—on Thursday, the Right Hon. William Forster made a violent attack upon Mr. Parnell. He said the recent disclosures had increased the suspicion that the Land League was connected with the outrages. The public expected that Mr. Parnell would have elucidated this point. No mere disclaimer would be sufficient. He charged Mr. Parnell with heading an organization which had started an agitation that promoted outrages and incited to murder. At this point, Mr. O'Kelly having shouted, "It's a lie!" several times, was named for suspension, and his suspension was ordered by a vote of 305 to 20. Mr. Forster then resumed and reiterated his charges against Mr. Parnell, quoting from that gentleman's speeches, in which he had said that murder was unnecessary. He said the wretches who committed the Phoenix Park assassinations had not acted on the letter, but according to the spirit of these speeches. Until Mr. Parnell expressed regret and repentance he could not communicate with him. There were loud cries for Mr. Parnell, but he did not move. The Marquis of Harrington then rose and expressed surprise at Mr. Parnell's silence, which he said was an admission that a prima-facie case had been established against the Irish leaders. The Government, he declared, had no intention of introducing any measures for an extensive change of policy with regard to Ireland that would be likely to arouse strong party feeling and absorb a large portion of the time of the House.

On Friday Mr. Parnell replied to Mr. Forster. He charged him with unfairness, and said he ought to be ashamed of himself for traducing him; that he had been challenged to defend himself, but he had nothing to defend himself from. He occupied a better position in the eyes of the Irish than Mr. Forster did in England. Mr. Parnell analyzed the evidence of Carey at the hearing of the Irish prisoners in Dublin, which he said was not a statement of fact, but of belief or hearsay. The evidence in reference to the source of the "murder fund," he said, rested upon the fact that some men while in prison had received checks from the sustentation fund of the Land League. Such aid had been given to thousands of prisoners. As proof that the prisoners charged with the Phoenix Park murders were not members of the Land League, Mr. Parnell pointed out that one of them had returned a check which had been sent to him from the sustentation fund, saying that he had nothing to do with the League. Mr. Forster's animus was due to the fact that he had at-

tempted to obtain a promise from him (Mr. Parnell), but had failed to do so and had lost his office. In concluding his remarks, Mr. Parnell declared that the present officials in Ireland were manifestly unfit to administer the Crimes Act. Mr. Forster ought to return to his congenial work. Mr. Parnell said he was hopeful that Ireland would weather this, as she had weathered other formidable oppressions. Mr. Trevelyan then proceeded to vindicate the policy of the Government in Ireland. He said that since the present Government had been commissioned to suppress crime, the number of murders had been reduced from three a month to one in the last four and a-half months. After some further debate Mr. Gorst's amendment was defeated by a vote of 259 to 176. The Parnellites abstained from voting.

On Monday Mr. Parnell moved an amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne, attacking the executive in Ireland for the administration of the Crimes Act. Its language is said to have been violent. In moving it, Mr. Parnell said that if there had been any reduction in the number of outrages in Ireland, it was only because the people were being kept down by the brutal, terrible Coercion Act, administered in a brutal, terrible way. He complained of the conduct of the Irish judges, who were appointed for political reasons, and were therefore unfit to try political causes. He said that if the Government, after the Phoenix Park murders were committed, had relied on the sympathy of the people instead of upon a tyrannical act, Ireland would have been pacified. He protested against the proclamation of meetings and the prosecution of the press. Freedom of speech did not exist in Ireland. The Hynes and other murder cases the juries were composed almost exclusively of Protestants, Castle tradesmen, and acquaintances of Earl Spencer, the Lord Lieutenant. The administration of the law was detested by everybody. He defied the Government to continue to govern Ireland without the sympathy of the people. The amendment of the Land Act was urgent, though even that would not quench the spirit of Irish nationality. He believed that Mr. Chamberlain was one of the few English members who correctly appreciated the Irish question. This remark was greeted with ironical cheers. Mr. Parnell said the Government now had a great opportunity to restore peace and order in Ireland. He was confident of victory, having one million of Irish in America behind him. The Right Hon. Andrew Porter, Attorney General for Ireland, replied to Mr. Parnell, and rebutted the charge of jury-packing. Mr. Parnell's amendment was finally rejected by a vote of 133 to 15.

In a debate in the House of Commons on Tuesday, Mr. Trevelyan said that although the Government had no large measures concerning the government of Ireland to introduce this year, they intended to bring forward several careful measures with regard to the distress existing there. He said the truth was that the holdings in the west of Ireland were too small; the people could not live on them without getting into debt. The question was whether by giving extraordinary relief the Government should stay emigration and merely postpone the evil day.

Since the disclosure made by Carey, a number of Irish-Americans and farmers' sons in Counties Armagh, Monaghan, and Louth have been secretly leaving for America. Mrs. Carey has been completely "boycotted" since she turned informer. Not one of her tenants has paid rent, and notices have been posted on the doorsteps of her houses, warning persons not to pay rent to a "cursed informer."

General MacAdams, who was suspected of being the "Number One" spoken of by Carey, the informer, indignantly denies the accusation, and has written to Mr. Trevelyan that he is willing to submit to the most rigid scrutiny of his actions.

Mr. Harrington, Secretary of the Organizing Committee of the Land League, who is now in jail for using intimidating language, has been elected without opposition to the seat in the House of Commons for Westmeath made vacant by the retirement of Mr. Gill.

The Prussian Landtag, on Thursday, discussed the estimates of the Ministry of Worship. Herr Windthorst, the leader of the Clerical party, said that the Government was blamable for the conflict with the Vatican, as it had not been in earnest in its negotiations. The Government is not desirous of peace with the Vatican, though the Emperor is in favor of it. Herr Gossler, Minister of Public Instruction, said he would place no difficulty in the way of religious schools, but only desired to prevent the exercise of certain special influence over the schools. He refused to answer Herr Windthorst's question as to whether the negotiations with the Curia had been broken off. The Government, he stated, had almost entirely removed the sequestration of the incomes of the clergy and pardoned Bishop Melchers. This statement caused general surprise.

A despatch from Rome on Thursday said that Cardinal Jacobini's last note pointed out that there was only one alternative: either Prussia must consent to a thorough revision of the May laws or she will deprive the Catholic Church in Germany of the very conditions of existence. A despatch to the London *Times* from Berlin on Saturday said the statement of Cardinal Jacobini, the Papal Secretary of State, that the Bishops had been authorized to give notice to the Government of clerical appointments as soon as the Reichstag and Landtag assented to measures insuring the free exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the free instruction of the clergy, is regarded as putting the end of the *Kulturkampf* as far off as ever.

The German Bundesrath has approved unanimously the bill prohibiting the importation of American pigs, pork, and sausages.

The Spanish Senate has agreed to prolong all existing treaties of commerce between Spain and foreign countries until March 15. The *Imparcial* newspaper of Madrid on Sunday published a detailed account of the discovery in Andalusia of societies whose aim is to destroy the rights of property and exterminate the bourgeois landowners. The Socialistic societies in Andalusia are said to number 1,000 members, including persons of high social standing. The Government has resolved to take energetic measures for their suppression.

While some members of an Anarchist committee were experimenting with dynamite at the village of Gansharten, in Belgium, on Sunday, an explosion took place in which several men were wounded. It is reported that Anarchist documents were seized at the explosion which show that a plot has been organized to murder the Czar at his coronation in May. It is also rumored that the seizure of Anarchist papers at Brussels will lead to the arrest of Louise Michel and several of her colleagues.

A despatch from St. Petersburg says: "It is stated that letters have been received by the authorities conveying threats to blow up the Kremlin at Moscow, where the Czar is to be crowned. A search was made, but nothing indicating preparations for the destruction of the palace was revealed. A close watch is kept, and the public are not allowed to enter the building."

The St. Petersburg *Golos* has been suppressed because of its mischievous tone in discussing state institutions and in describing the intentions of the Government regarding the reforms which have taken place during the last quarter of a century. An imperial ukase has been published appointing a committee to examine and amend the laws relating to Jews. Forty students at St. Petersburg were imprisoned on Monday for expressing doubts of the administrative ability of Count Tolstoi, Minister of Public Instruction.

THE TAX ON BOOKS.

MR. MORRILL presented a petition in the Senate on Wednesday, from Mr. E. C. Stedman, the poet, of this city, against the abolition of the duty on books, on the ground that it ought not to be abolished till the duty on the raw materials of book manufacture is abolished. Mr. Stedman is the third or fourth American author of note who has petitioned Congress in this sense. He does not, however, go as far as Dr. Holmes and Mr. Whittier, who avowed that they shared the apprehension by which their publisher has long been tormented, that the American mind, if not protected by the tariff, would be injured by foreign literature. He has in his eye, we presume, the interest of American publishers simply, who would, he thinks, be undersold in the American market by foreign publishers, so long as the material of which books are made is heavily taxed here.

We have more than once pointed out that the argument that putting books on the free list would make books too cheap, is, if sound, absolutely destructive of the argument by which the giving of unconditional copyright to foreign authors has all along been resisted—that it would make books too dear. In the various discussions which have raged during the last twenty years between the American and English publishers about copyright, the need of cheap books for a society like ours, in which political security is so largely dependent on popular intelligence, has been always put in the forefront of the American battle. English publishers should not be allowed to enter the American market with copyrighted books, we were told, because they would follow the English custom of making them dear, whereas the highest interests of the American nation required that books—foreign as well as others—should be cheap. Are we to understand Mr. Stedman that the American publishers have abandoned this ground, and hold that the highest interests of the American people require that foreign books should be dear, and that what America needs is not so much numerous readers as thriving publishers? Has Mr. Munro, the eminent Pirate, really destroyed the old passion of American publishers for cheap popular literature?

In the second place, we would ask what advantage can it be to American authors or publishers to tax books which they would never reprint here, or think of reprinting, and which probably are out of print in the country of their birth? Why must the American student or scholar pay twenty-five per cent. duty on any English book, however old, of which he may stand in need—mathematical, geographical, historical, metaphysical—which no American publisher ever dreams of republishing? What has the duty on paper, type, or printers' ink to do with the importation of such books, composing, we venture to say, nine tenths of all the books imported by private order? How is Mr. Stedman, a poet and critic, injured in mind, body, or estate by such books being cheapened to his countrymen? How do his publishers suffer by books being cheapened which they never think of reprinting? Are they not, on the contrary,

served by it? Is not all literature served by everything which diffuses knowledge and fosters the habit of reading?

A very amusing incident occurred in England, the other day, which suggests a possible explanation of some of the opposition on this side of the water to the free admission of foreign books, even the old and rare ones. There is an Act of Parliament which permits villages to set up free public libraries by a vote, we believe, of the ratepayers. The question came before the voters of Brentford, a bucolic town in Middlesex, and it was decided in the negative, under the influence of the argument, "What's the use of books?" and that if any one "wanted to read a book," he could "go out and get one for sixpence." Now, the idea which underlay this argument was clearly that one book, like one apple or banana, was as good as another, and that to a man who wanted a book it made no difference what book he got. Put into terms of political economy, this means that each book competes with every other, just as each potato competes with all other potatoes. We will not assert that Dr. Holmes and Mr. Stedman labor under this droll Brentford hallucination, but their petitions to Congress would certainly give an unscrupulous opponent an excuse for charging them with it. It is only on the theory that the sale of any book in particular prevents the sale of all other books, that a poet can be interested in making all books dear, even those which his own publisher does not and never would produce. No theory of the place of books in civilized society has ever placed them quite so low as this, or given the relation of an author to his work a character so purely mercantile.

It must not be supposed that in saying all this we are ignorant of or indifferent to the arguments in favor of compelling foreign authors to appear in the United States through American publishers as the condition of an American copyright. We think they are in the main strong. But they do not touch the question of taxing non-copyrighted or non-pirated books. Nor do they account for the fact that though no power on earth can prevent the American Congress from giving foreign authors publishing through an American house an American copyright, and thus both obeying the first law of morality and giving the people cheap books, it has never done so, and has never been severely pressed to do so; so that the position in which the American reader is now placed is such that he must either wait indefinitely to see whether a foreign book will be reprinted in this country, or be taxed one-fourth of its price if he presumes to import it.

SILVER DOLLARS.

THERE is no probability that Congress will reach a vote on any of the bills or resolutions pending in reference to the continued coinage of silver dollars. The coinage must, therefore, continue at the rate of at least two millions per month for ten months to come. The amount in the Treasury at the present time is about \$98,000,000, and the amount on the 1st of January next will probably be \$120,000,000. The issue of gold certificates has taken the place of that of silver certificates since the law

of last year went into effect, so that we cannot expect any considerable purchase of silver dollars by the people to offset the Treasury's purchases of bullion. The two millions per month are therefore a dead investment and sheer waste of the national resources.

If there were any fixed time or amount at which to stop this insane proceeding, it would be possible to deal with the existing stock of dollars by abolishing small notes and leaving the vacuum thus created to be filled by silver. But while there is a limit to the demand for notes of denominations less than five dollars (somewhat less than \$50,000,000 are in circulation), there is no limit to the production of silver dollars under the present Coinage Act. The law is an anomaly, unlike anything seen or heard of in tale or history. It runs counter to all experience and all principle. It violates the fundamental ideas of coinage and of money—not in the fact of making silver dollars legal tender, but in making more of them than are wanted. We do not, nor does any other nation, coin gold, or copper, or nickel, except when it is called for by the demands of trade. Nor do we issue greenbacks or banknotes upon the principles applied to silver. This metal, which, its friends tell us, has been so much persecuted and maltreated, is really the only thing going by the name of money which is singled out for special nursing. We have turned the Treasury into a hospital for its treatment, and levied taxes to the amount of \$24,000,000 per annum for its comfortable support. Not even our sick harbors and rivers, our Cheesquakes creeks and Muskegon inlets, get so much of our tender care and hard-earned money.

Among all the clouds hanging over the national prosperity at the present time, crippling industry and deterring the investment of capital, nothing is so alarming to business men as the anomalous silver coinage. As nobody can see the end of it, and as nearly every investor thinks that it means mischief, without knowing exactly how or when, its possible evils are an ever-present terror to the commercial classes. Everybody who thinks at all perceives that we are dealing with silver upon utterly false principles. The silvermen themselves admit this when they demand that the coinage be put upon the same basis as that of gold. They acknowledge that it is no part of the Government's function to buy bullion, either silver or gold, and to coin it beyond the wants of the community. They are as ready as other people to see that we are violating an economic law which lies at the root of trade and industry. It is no wonder if those who differ from them in policy conclude that there must be some adequate punishment for the continued violation of that as of other laws.

It is known, also, that the gold reserve of the Treasury is falling while the stock of useless silver is rising. According to a carefully-prepared statement in the *Public* of February 8, the Treasury's reserve of gold has fallen \$41,500,000 in the space of seventeen months. The silver coinage has been augmented \$34,000,000 in the same time, or nearly as much as the gold reserve has decreased. The gold reserve being under the

control of the Secretary so long as he has a large surplus revenue—it being optional with him to redeem a greater or less amount of the public debt in a given time—there is no necessary connection between the two items of gold and silver. It would be possible for the stock of both metals to be increasing at the same time, instead of the one increasing and the other diminishing. But the fact remains that whatever silver we buy we pay for with gold, and that when we buy our monthly quota of bullion we have \$2,000,000 less to be applied to the redemption of bonds and the stoppage of interest on the public debt. The operation of the Silver Coinage Act, therefore, in addition to its other mischiefs, prolongs the public debt unnecessarily. Moreover, it is not impossible that the reduction of taxes by the present Congress may leave the Government with a deficiency of revenue, in which case silver would accumulate at the expense of the gold reserve in spite of the Secretary.

This question is of more immediate importance than the tariff question, yet it has not received one hour's discussion in either branch of Congress during the present session. We say that it is of more immediate importance, because every day's delay brings us nearer the possible catastrophe of a change of monetary standards, or a conflict of standards, or some other tripping stone, which will probably suffice, when it is reached, to plunge all business into confusion and the industrial classes into dire distress. As every note of warning is drowned at Washington by the din and clangor of iron and steel, tin plates and broken crockery, we suggest to the commercial classes everywhere that they put their business, as far as possible, on the gold basis, by stamping, printing, or writing the word "gold" on every piece of paper they receive or execute. The banks of New York and Boston have done this already by resolution, and the banks elsewhere, National, State, and Savings, will do so in due time; they too will come in out of the rain before there is any great shower. Nearly all corporations and large money-lenders exercise this prudence, which cannot be too highly commended or too generally imitated.

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN RUSSIA.

A FORTNIGHT more, and Czar Alexander III. will have reigned two years. This is longer, perhaps, than friend or foe deemed probable on the evening of the terrible day when his father was torn to pieces by the bombs of Ryssakoff and his associates. His own hope seems to be reviving and a feeling of security growing up at the Court. The Imperial family are no longer hiding at Gatchina or Peterhof. The Czar rides, and occasionally walks, through the streets of St. Petersburg without a heavy escort or a hedge of extra police. He dares to visit a school, to appear at a theatre, and to spend a few hours at a state ball in the Winter Palace. The spectre of Nihilism has lost much of its terrors. The year now closing has witnessed but few murders by the hand of conspirators—the assassination of General Strelnikoff on the promenade in Odessa being the most striking

case—and each act of revolutionary violence has been followed by the removal to Siberia of hundreds of convicted or suspected revolutionists. The Army and the peasantry, though not free from infection, can still be relied upon, and the Church is an instrument in the hands of the rulers. The nobility surrounding the Court is apparently full of ardent loyalty, the public press preaches fidelity, and the circulation of clandestine sheets has almost been suppressed. The most important sign of revived courage and confidence is the announcement, by the Imperial Manifesto of February 5, of the Czar's intention to be publicly crowned in his ancient capital, Moscow, "in May next."

It is true, a tone of almost lugubrious sadness pervades this very manifesto, in which the Czar tells how he ascended the throne in the midst of grief and horror; how, bowing before the judgment of God, he determined in his heart not to perform the sacred rite of coronation until the feelings excited by the great crime had had time to calm down; and that he is now ready to execute the will of God, receive, with the crown, the Holy Sacrament, and join with his people in fervent and humble prayer. More than that, there is an expression of uncertainty or fear in the words "in May next," unaccompanied as they are by a statement of the day chosen for the great national solemnity. Nor is there a word of cheer in the whole document. It contains no allusion to any achievement of the first two years of the reign, to the recovery of internal peace or prosperity, to happy auguries of the future. The fact is, there is absolutely nothing to boast of or to be thankful for in these two years, unless it is the mere survival of the monarch and the Empire. Nihilism has been partly disarmed, but not stifled. Discontent and alarm are still general. No liberal reform of any importance has been ventured upon. Not the least response has been made to the general demand of the enlightened classes for a constitutional régime. Reactionaries of the most pronounced type, such as Tolstol and Pobiedonostzeff, hold the reins of power, and even such moderate liberals as Loris-Melikoff or Peter Shuvaloff are kept aloof. The press is muzzled as it never was under Alexander II. The peasantry are left a prey to extortion, want, and intemperance; the Treasury is depleted, the prisons are gorged. No conquest, no victory has been achieved abroad. Skobeleff, the popular hero, had to be rebuked, shortly before his death, for bold patriotic utterances which were distasteful to the suspicious German neighbor. The arrogance of England, in her settlement of Egyptian affairs, had to be borne without a loud protest.

While everything is stagnant or supine in the inner spheres, a change is perceptible in the doings and tendencies of Russian diplomacy abroad. Internally distracted and financially weakened; isolated by the girdle which the Austro-German alliance has drawn around her; provoked by the insolence of Great Britain; distressed by the impotence of the French Republic, her constantly-dreamed-of future ally (an impotence sealed for a time by the death of Gambetta)—Russia now openly manifests a determination to cultivate anew

friendly relations with her neighbors, Austria and Germany, as she did in the time of Nicholas; to observe a peaceable *modus vivendi* between herself and the Curia of the Vatican, and indefinitely to postpone all further schemes of aggression in the Balkan Peninsula. The late journey of her Minister of Foreign Affairs, Giers, in the course of which he visited Rome and Vienna, was evidently undertaken for the sake of negotiations in this direction, and these could not have failed to be successful, as the Russian diplomatist was empowered to make concessions everywhere. The Curia has obtained concessions in regard to the treatment of the Catholic Church in the Polish provinces of the Czar, and Austria-Hungary—such are the indications at least—has been promised a neutral forbearance in respect of her doings in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and her dealings with Montenegro, Servia, and Rumania, including the vexed question of Danubian navigation superintendence. In return the Curia has undoubtedly promised to abstain from fomenting agitation in favor of the Polish nationality, and Austria-Hungary is said to have waived all objections to a union, at some future day, of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumania. Possibly Russia has also been assured by the allied Courts of Vienna and Berlin of a friendly attitude in case complications in Turkistan and the Kulja territories should make her inclined to draw the sword there where England is most anxious to see her keep the peace. What tends to give color to such a supposition is the repeated announcement made of late in Russian papers that hostile outbreaks against the Russians were feared in Central Asia, and still more the strange accord with which the organs of Katkoff and Aksakoff, the leading Pan-Slavic publicists and confidential friends of the present Government, have been recently engaged in demonstrating that German and Slav are not, and ought not to be, foes, after all. A new programme has been forced upon the Russian Government and its supporters by altered conditions within and abroad, and with it the Czar may go to the coronation at Moscow. It may read—Peace in Europe, advance in Asia; and Russian patriotism may interpret it as meaning defiance to England.

THE NOVEL OF TODAY.

A CURIOUS international literary discussion has been recently started by a very innocent remark of Mr. Howells, in the course of a magazine article, intended to convey the idea that the art of novel-making had made considerable progress since the days of Dickens and Thackeray. The discussion has branched out in all sorts of directions, and has furnished an opportunity for every kind of moral, including, of course, the perennial one of international sensitiveness; but one of the points brought up—the decline of the novel of "purpose," *i. e.*, the novel which aims at effecting the reformation of some social abuse, or redressing some wrong or injustice—deserves more attention than it has received. There is no doubt about the fact. Neither in England nor in America does any novelist of the first rank attempt to use the novel as a means of reform in public opinion, of stirring up enthusiasm or indignation on social subjects. There is one

living novelist, Mr. Charles Reade, who made a great reputation only a generation ago by novels in which such subjects as prison reform and private asylum abuses played a great part, but even he has abandoned this sort of writing. In this country, what we may call the French view of literary art—i. e., the view that a story is told for its own sake, and not for any ulterior purpose, or in order to teach any lesson—is steadily acted upon by Mr. James; and Mr. Howells, as we understand him, thinks Mr. James is right, and has consciously adopted it himself.

Changes of literary fashion are generally produced by a variety of causes, slowly affecting the structure of society from year to year, and he would be a very bold man who should undertake to explain in a few words why epic poems are no longer attempted, or why romantic writing is a thing of the past. But with regard to purpose in fiction, there are one or two points which suggest themselves as explanatory of the change that has taken place. One is, that the subjects in this generation which interest persons of a reforming turn of mind are subjects which hardly lend themselves to fiction. A novelist, to effect a reform, must fire the heart and imagination of his readers. Fifty years ago, when the world felt down-trodden and oppressed; when the heel of the tyrant was on the neck of man; when superstition and ignorance and bigotry made the lot of the lowly hard, and suffering and injustice common, the novelist had a fine field for enlisting the sympathies of his readers. The feeling against abuses of all kind was closely allied to the democratic movement which was sweeping over the world. In Dickens it is always the poor and ignorant who are wronged by the wealthy and powerful having the control of the laws in their hands, and a strong picture of this sort of tyranny will always fire the heart of the novel reader. In America the great novel of this sort, a generation ago, was 'Uncle Tom's Cabin.'

Since that time, however, the emancipation of the down-trodden and lowly has been, in most countries, pretty complete; they have been given all that they asked; and in England to a great extent, and in this country altogether, they have the Government itself in their hands. There is no tyrannical social system to which the novel reader can attribute abuses. The questions which have arisen in this country, while of equal importance, are not of the same value for purposes of fiction with those of an earlier day. You can fill a reader's mind with indignation at slavery, but it is difficult to imagine a novelist basing a successful story on the evils of a protective system as illustrated by the duty on steel blooms. Civil-service reform, biennial legislatures, the fee and salary question, codification, copyright, seats in the House for cabinet ministers—all these are important matters, but they are troublesome to use in fiction. Even the old subjects, like prison abuses, which involved the idea of wrong and tyranny, have assumed a new aspect, for all the abuses have been remedied in theory, and if they still go on in fact, it is not because of any tyranny or oppression anywhere in our social system, but because of other causes which do not lay a foundation for that sympathetic interest which was the capital on

which novelists like Dickens, Reade, and Mrs. Stowe worked. The following newspaper explanation of the termination of the revolt at Sing Sing illustrates what we mean:

"Mr. Paddy Wynn, the ringleader in the serious revolt at Sing Sing, yesterday resigned that position, and the revolt came to an end, at least for the time being. We regret to add that Wynn quitted the bad eminence of ringleader not because a spasm of virtue had laid hold of him, but owing to the fact that his Ulster County friends and admirers had united in telegraphing him their confidence that he was shortly to be the recipient of a pardon."

No rising novelist, with these facts before him, would see his way clear to stirring up the community on the subject of Paddy's sufferings.

Besides all this, the ventilation the press now gives all abuses, as a matter of business, helps to take the wind out of the sails of the novelist with a "purpose." Fifty years ago the press was itself much more closely connected with the class which was interested in the perpetuation of abuses than it is now. It kept silent or threw cold water upon reform schemes. Now it is the reformers' regular means of agitation, and he must be a very feeble agitator who cannot get a hearing through it. It furnishes to reformers a more immediate and certain vehicle than the novel.

These causes help to draw off the reform fervor from the novel, and turn it into other channels. The novelist has, however, still left him just what he always had for his main materials, and it is apparently his idea that he can get along well enough with these.

SYMPTOMS OF IRISH FEELING TOWARD ENGLAND.

LONDON, February 5.

ENGLISH politicians have had too long an experience of Irish troubles to feel sanguine that a diminution of disorders in Ireland indicates any deep or permanent change in the sentiments of the people. Still, after the acute crisis of 1881 and the first half of 1882, the comparative tranquillity of the last six months has been welcomed as a cheering sign by all Ministerialists, and by moderate and sensible men of both parties. There has been a sensible decline in the returns of agrarian crimes over all the south and west of the island. There has been a general disposition to take advantage both of the Land Act and of the Arrears Act of last session. It is true that both measures are complained of as inadequate; still, under both, a good deal has been done and is being done which, by alleviating the distress of the peasantry, must tend to quiet their minds and remove some of the provocations to outrage. Finally, the impunity which crime had so largely and so long enjoyed has been broken down by the conviction of a number of murderers, and by the supposed discovery—one must say supposed, because the investigation is not yet complete—of the secret societies for assassination which have inspired so much terror in Ireland itself. If it should turn out, as is probable, that these societies are really very small, and not widely ramified among the people, there will be a further sense of relief.

All these features of the present situation, taken together, render it more encouraging than any we have seen since the formation of the Land League made agitation formidable; and it is satisfactory to note that such improvement as exists is not due to the exceptionally severe provisions of the Prevention of Crime Act of last session, for these provisions—such

as that permitting the Lord Lieutenant to order a trial by judges instead of by a jury—have mostly been left unused. If things look more peaceful, it is partly because the administration of Ireland, and especially its police system, is being improved; because Lord Spencer has been more skilful in his dealings with the people than Mr. Forster, having had the benefit of Mr. Forster's experience; and most of all because the Land Act has really opened up to the peasantry a prospect of mending their condition, and given them a different idea of what may be expected from the English than they had heretofore entertained. More than half of the 88,000 applications made to the Land Courts have been disposed of, and nearly half of these by agreements out of court made by the parties when they saw the principles on which the Court was proceeding. More than 86,000 applications, involving 185,385 holdings, have been made under the Arrears Act, although it was at first represented as quite inadequate to the needs of the case.

These are cheering signs, on which Mr. Gladstone and his supporters have naturally laid much stress; but they are by no means the only facts to be regarded. Events are every now and then happening, or coming to light, which show how far we still are from anything like a reconciliation between the Irish Nationalists and the English nation. The sympathy which the populace of Dublin have repeatedly shown for persons charged with murders, or attempts to murder, is an almost graver sign than the existence of the secret societies which plot these murders, for they may consist of a mere handful of men. The language of the Nationalist leaders, such as Mr. Davitt and Mr. Healy, in their denunciations of England, is as vehement as ever before. And when an election occurs, the voters seize with avidity the opportunity of returning as members persons whose chief claim seems to lie in the bitterness of their hostility to the very Government which has been trying to conciliate Ireland by the Land Act. We have just had an instance of this at Mallow. Mallow is an insignificant place in the south of Ireland, with less than three hundred electors. It is ridiculous that such a place should have a member at all, and in any redistribution of seats it will of course disappear. But its three hundred voters are probably types of the voters in the Irish towns generally, and fairly represent the sentiments of their class. They have just rejected the new Solicitor-General for Ireland, and chosen against him, by a majority of nearly two to one, the editor of an extreme Nationalist paper, whom the Government have been prosecuting on the charge of sedition. This prosecution was his recommendation to the electors, and he made it such himself. With symptoms like this, it can hardly be doubted that if a general election were to take place now, the Nationalist party would come back to the House of Commons with twice its present strength, claiming far more effectually than it can do now to represent the Irish people. That is to say, the desire to be separated from England, to have as little as possible to do with her, is as strong as ever in Ireland, and is the expression, not so much of any serious plan for having an independent Irish Government, and thereby promoting the welfare of the people, as of a deep, fierce, almost unreasoning dislike of the English Government and England herself.

The English are only now beginning to realize the strength of this dislike. They have been kept so long from understanding it by a fact which makes its existence the stranger—the fact that the dislike is not reciprocal. This is not one of those cases of race hatred of which Europe had so many to show, such as the hatred of Pole and

Russian, of German and Slav. The English in England (who must be carefully distinguished from the Anglo-Irish or English Protestants settled in Ireland) have never really hated the Irish. Formerly, they didn't know enough about them to hate them; and of late years, since communication has become easier and vast numbers of Irish have settled in the English and Scotch cities, though there has been some bitterness against the new comers on the part of those humbler laborers with whom they competed for work, and whose wages they lowered, nothing like a general hostility has displayed itself. It is plain, however, that the Irish could not feel bitter toward England if England did not give them some cause. History alone will not quite account for the phenomenon. Even the behavior of the Anglo-Irish, their arrogance and tyranny, from the time of William the Third down to that of William the Fourth, when Protestant ascendancy began to be shaken, will not solve the problem, because these Anglo-Irish themselves—this very dominant caste which so long ruled Ireland by the aid of English power—is itself also full of bitterness against the English, and only sticks to them because it dislikes and fears the aboriginal Irishman, the Catholic Celt, even more. It is worth while, therefore, to ask what it is in the attitude of the ordinary Englishman, as well as of the English Government as a whole, which produces that peculiar irritation and resentment which so many Irishmen, of different ranks and creeds, feel toward England.

The first fact to recognize is that an Irishman—that is, a person born in Ireland, or of Irish parentage—has no substantial disadvantage to contend with in England. He is just as well received in society, is just as likely to make a good marriage, or get a good place, rise in the Army, or Navy, or civil service, succeed at the bar, or in medicine, or in the Church, or in trade, as if he were an Englishman. Not only is every career equally open to him, but success in it is just as easy for him. A vast number of Irishmen have attained eminence as men of letters, or men of science, or lawyers, or journalists, or soldiers, or scholars, or ecclesiastics; and I doubt if one of these could say that his nationality has stood in his way. Lord Cairns is an Irishman, and so are Generals Wolseley and Roberts, and the Bishop of Peterborough, and Mr. Charles Russell (one of the foremost leaders of our bar), and Mr. Stopford Brooke, perhaps the most eminent of London preachers; and no one thinks of their Hibernian origin as making, or having ever made, any difference to them. Only the other day a brilliant young Irishman was chosen Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, against distinguished Scotchmen. It may have counted against him that he was not a Scotchman, but it would never have occurred to any elector to notice that he was an Irishman. Nor has an Irishman any social slights or mortifications to put up with. Sometimes one who wants to sneer at him may throw in a reference to his nationality by way of pointing the sneer, as Dr. Johnson used to do, and as some people in England still do, with Scotchmen; but that is all. Even among the poor, though the Irish element forms the lowest part of the population in most of the great towns, and competes with the native Englishman for the less skilled forms of labor, there is little animosity between the two races. An Irish laborer is never prevented from getting work, nor an Irish girl from finding a place, by the fact of his or her origin. People are accustomed to quote the phrase, "No Irish need apply," but it counts for very little in the humbler kinds of employment, and in the higher ones it does not count at all. So far, then, as the substance of things is concerned, the individual

Irishman has full justice, and nothing to complain of.

When groups of Irishmen, or the Irish as a whole, are concerned, the case is somewhat different. The English have no sympathy, hardly any tolerance even, for any association of persons wishing to keep up what they think a foolish and worthless distinction from themselves. A person or a society or an institution which puts forward its Hibernian character is at once met by coolness or contempt. Why do they want to be Irish, the Englishman thinks, when they can be English? We are willing enough to take them and give them every chance, asking no questions, but recognizing them as members of our nation; and instead of that, they keep putting forward a nationality which has nothing to recommend it and much to discredit it. This attitude toward Irishmen (if the expression may be permitted) lets the Irish know what Englishmen really think of their country and their national type, and they resent it keenly, especially because they contrast it with the way in which Scotch nationality seems to them to be treated. Scotch nationality is, no doubt, a much more purely historical and sentimental matter. It has no political significance; it never causes any trouble between the two countries or even leads to Scotchmen forming organizations of their own for any political purposes. Still, it exists and even makes some noise. Scotchmen are fond of posing as Scotchmen and celebrating their national glories. The English, while sometimes a little amused, are not unsympathetic, and whenever they go to Scotland are profuse in their compliments to the Scotch nature and Scotch traditions. No doubt those traditions are a far pleasanter subject of contemplation than Irish history, which is a record of strife, misery, and injustice such as few other parts of Europe can present. But this does not make the contemptuous air of the English toward Irish nationality any less wounding. In this respect, therefore, the Irish may be said to have some ground for complaint. The grievance is largely sentimental; yet that does not prevent it from being a grievance. And it has the practical consequence of making the English less disposed to believe that self-government is feasible in Ireland; that the Irish, as Irish, could get on and manage local affairs in a reasonable way.

Perhaps the simplest way of putting the case is to say that the English habitually assume their type of civilization, character, manners, government, to be the best and highest type, and therefore that the Irish ought naturally to be glad to accept it and sink their own type in it. Hence, while the individual Irishman is welcomed to England, and allowed to gain all that an Englishman can, the idea of cultivating and maintaining something which is lower, and not in itself laudable, appears absurd and pernicious. It is not so much the manners of the English that are at fault (for they do not, now at any rate, behave with rudeness or insolence in Ireland), as their incapacity for understanding the Irish character, and that waywardness or chivalry (whichever it is to be called) which makes them cling to their nationality just because it is unfortunate. In fact, they take the Irish too seriously, and would perhaps succeed better if they were less anxious to succeed.

The Mallow election may be important, not only as a symptom of the undiminished irritation of the Nationalist party, but as an encouragement to its leaders to play up to these feelings by attacks on the Government in Parliament. There are, of course, always administrative mistakes and blunders, at least among subordinate officials, which may be made the ground of an attack. No one would be surprised if the

first nights of the coming session were occupied by Irish debates.

PROSPECTS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY SESSION.

LONDON, February 15, 1883.

THE session of Parliament begins to-day under unusual circumstances. A new code of procedure is going to be tried, and both the Tory and the Irish Oppositions have strong motives to make it fail, because they have opposed its most important provisions. The chief measures to be introduced by the Government are not, as has been usually the case, of a party character, and will not affect the distribution of political power or the interests of any particular classes in the community. They ought not, therefore, to excite party hostility and be met by any party opposition. But, in point of fact, such is the heat and bitterness which prevail, they will doubtless encounter much resistance—a resistance really directed rather at their authors than at themselves. Finally, the head of the Government—the omnipotent head of the dominant party as well as of the Government—will be absent.

A few days ago, it began to be rumored that Mr. Gladstone might not appear during the first few days, and now we are told that he may possibly remain in the milder air of the south of France till Easter, which this year falls earlier than usual. This is taken by some as a sign that he will soon retire from the Ministry altogether, his strength, it is said, having more seriously declined than was supposed, and the need for repose and quiet having become more imperious. But probably this is not the true interpretation. No doubt he has for some time past expressed a wish to abandon political strife and devote his last years to those studies and pursuits, literary and theological, in which his interest has never slackened. But his temporary absence, while still retaining the highest office, is rather a sign that this retirement will not take place immediately, but that he feels the importance to his party of his continuing to hold the leadership, even while he commits the work for a time to his lieutenants. In this he is certainly doing the best thing he can for that party's interests. There are elements of discord in the Liberal majority which might easily put it in peril but for the ardent loyalty which both the Centre and the Left of that majority feel for the Prime Minister, and the unlimited confidence which Liberals throughout the country place in him. Although Lord Hartington is greatly respected as an upright, straightforward, courageous man, who is decided, if not advanced, in his Liberalism, still neither his followers in Parliament nor the masses of Great Britain have learned to know him intimately, to realize and value and obey his personality in the way which gives a leader ascendancy, and makes a policy adopted because it is his. Hence it is clear gain that he should have the opportunity which Mr. Gladstone's absence will give him of directing his party in the House of Commons for some weeks, while it is even more a gain that Mr. Gladstone, by retaining the office of Prime Minister, should hold his party together and maintain the confidence of the nation—or rather of the majority which supports the present Ministry—in the Cabinet and its measures. If he finds that he can continue to reign without the necessity of trying his health by the severe toil of the House of Commons, he is all the more likely to consent to prolong his reign; and his colleagues have every motive of interest for desiring that he should do so, for he is the principal source of the unity and hopefulness of the party which supports them in the country.

Little of consequence has happened since the

close of last session, and nothing which alters the relative position of parties. Of the Liberals I have just spoken. Without being in a state of excitement or enthusiasm—for there has been no fighting lately to excite them, and no measures are announced calculated to raise enthusiasm—they are in as good a position as they have held any time since the general election of 1880, the causes of division still seeming to slumber, and the general sentiment being one of satisfaction with their leaders and themselves. The condition of the Tory party is just the reverse. They are dissatisfied with their leaders, querulous as regards the past, apprehensive of the future. They don't know whether to follow the recognized heads of the party—those members of Lord Beaconsfield's Government on whom after his death his authority naturally devolved—or the younger and more restless spirits who have distinguished themselves as active skirmishers during the last three sessions. Neither set of politicians has given to the world anything but criticisms; neither has produced any sensible effect upon opponents or upon the country at large. The Tories have a feeling not only that valuable opportunities of damaging the Liberal Government have been neglected or misused by the official leaders, but that these eminent persons, from Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote downward, have nothing positive, nothing constructive, to offer; nothing which has any attraction for the bulk of the people. For a time they thought that as the Liberals had come into power in 1880 after a series of unsparring invectives directed against Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy, so a similar series of attacks on Mr. Gladstone and the more radical of his colleagues would be followed by a similar effect in discrediting him. However, after the invectives had been tried, Mr. Gladstone was as strong as before. Next, they fancied that the Liberal victory had been due to local organization, and especially to what is called the "Birmingham Caucus System." Efforts were accordingly made to establish local Conservative associations everywhere, and by them to work a Conservative propaganda in the towns. Apparently, this experiment has had no better success, for the Conservative organization languishes, and the townspeople are apathetic. One or two bold men have tried to persuade the working classes that it is to Conservatism, not to Liberalism, that they must look for social reforms, and have started the cry of Tory Democracy. But this also has fallen flat, for the inventors have omitted to explain in what respect the working classes are specially interested in resisting the programme of the Radicals, and particularly in upholding the power of the House of Lords, the Established Church, the landed aristocracy, the county magistrates, and the Corporation of the City of London. Thus there is much despondency among Tories of the upper class, who feel their position all the stranger because the society in which they move is almost wholly Tory either in name or in fact. Three-fourths of the nobility are Tories, and the rest very moderate Liberals. The proportion is the same among the landowners generally; it is almost the same among professional men and capitalists; while it is very rare to find any Liberals at all among members of the military and naval service. Since all the people they meet and talk to are of their own way of thinking, and join in their lamentations over the approaching ruin of the country, while at the same time the Government continues to be in the hands of those whom they regard as firebrands, they get a painful sense of their own helplessness, and imagine the people—those electors who support this wicked Liberal Government—to be either more destructively minded, or more

hopelessly deluded, than they had fancied in the golden days of Lord Beaconsfield. There never was a greater opening for another Lord Beaconsfield than at this moment. If some able and eloquent man were to appear in the Tory party, with a gift for exciting popular enthusiasm, and with a positive programme of policy to unfold, he might rapidly climb to the highest place in English politics and society. But none such appears.

It would be a mistake to argue from the present despondency of the Tories, or even from their want of first-rate men, that they are powerless as a party. Their despondency is due not so much to weakness as to impatience. If they will be content to wait, time will do more for them than they seem likely to do for themselves, and will bring them into office again, perhaps before three or four years have passed. Many forces are in their favor, and not the least of these is that disunion among the Liberals which may possibly follow Mr. Gladstone's retirement. There is, however, no sign that this session will do any more for them than the last, nor that their tactics will be in any respect different. They will probably devote themselves to minute criticisms of the Ministerial measures, seeking not so much to defeat them directly as to break them down in detail by striking out all the stronger provisions and by spending so much time on discussion that it will become impossible to get all of them carried. As has been already observed, these measures are not to be of a strictly party character. Every one who is not a member of the Corporation of the City of London admits that a new municipal government for London is wanted. The bill which the Ministry promises is clearly called for; but it will be a long and complex one, raising many questions on which opinion may well be divided, and it will therefore give many openings for hostile or obstructive criticism, while, as it affects London only, the rest of the country will not be keenly interested in its fate. Whether a bill for remodelling local government in the counties will be brought in, is not yet known—possibly the Cabinet has not yet decided. Such a bill is also greatly needed, but it will afford even ampler opportunities for criticism, and could hardly be passed in this session. Bankruptcy, and patents, and a criminal code, and compensation to agricultural tenants for unexhausted improvements, and the prevention of corrupt practices at elections, are all important matters, which deserve the mention they are to obtain in the Queen's Speech this afternoon. They ought to be dealt with quite apart from party prepossessions. But they are complicated questions, and it will require a rare and unusual degree of virtue in an Opposition to induce it to abstain from endeavoring to defeat some at least of these measures. The prospect before us is therefore one rather of a succession of skirmishes and petty engagements than of any pitched battles; and if this prospect is realized, the session will be unexciting, and may even be fruitful.

There remains, however, another source of danger and difficulty: I mean the Irish question, and the Irish Nationalist party. The perplexities of Irish administration are so numerous that the Government may at any moment make mistakes or find itself in perils which will give the Tory Opposition opportunities for arraigning it. The Nationalist Opposition, by the law of its own existence, is bound to condemn all the Government do. This is what their supporters in Ireland expect from them, and they like it done with at least as much vehemence of language as the rules of Parliament permit. No doubt Mr. Parnell and his friends will complain of much that has been recently done in Ireland. No doubt they will propose to amend

the Land Act in several important particulars. No doubt they will introduce some scheme for popularizing local government in Ireland. The resistance which the Government is likely to offer to such proposals will be another ground of contention, but whether such contention will be as bitter as in the last two sessions, or lead to as much waste of time, will depend on the circumstances of the moment. The only prediction that can safely be made is that Irish affairs will continue to occupy, whether the Government like it or not, a considerable share of the attention of the House of Commons. But it is hardly likely that the Ministry will show their hand on the subject of Home Rule or local self-government any more fully than they have heretofore done. They will probably say that till they deal with local government in England they can't be expected to reorganize it in Ireland. There is already a division of opinion among Liberals on the subject; some holding that Ireland must have at least as much of the popular element in her local authorities as England is to have; others thinking that in the present state of Irish opinion this would be dangerous, as giving fresh outlets for political disaffection. The Ministry will doubtless wish to prevent so disagreeable a division from becoming more conspicuous than it now is, and this will be another reason for trying to postpone the topic till another session.

As regards foreign affairs, there are at present no menacing clouds on the horizon. Even those who are least comfortable about Egypt, and who wish that the Government had not undertaken any responsibility in connection with it, do not seem to see what else could have been than what Lord Dufferin has suggested. The behavior of France in the Pacific and in Madagascar has caused some irritation against her; but her internal dissensions may probably make her hold her hand in those regions, and give the irritation time to subside. The rest of Europe is quiet. So far as our foreign outlook is concerned, the Ministry have every facility for fixing their minds on domestic legislation and getting a good deal of it through in this session. If they fail to do so, their credit with the country will seriously suffer. Y.

LA BRUYÈRE.

PARIS, February 1, 1883.

THE collection which the bookseller Hachette has undertaken under the general title of "Les Grands Écrivains de la France" is a literary monument of the first importance. It gives the best text of our classical authors, and the commentaries are full of the most valuable information. M. Servois, who is now Director-General of the French Archives, undertook to publish the part devoted to La Bruyère; he spent several years in this work. His edition is now complete, and it is enough to say that from this moment we have a standard edition of the great moralist of the seventeenth century. The "Characters" of La Bruyère will always have a chosen place in a good library, next to the "Thoughts" of Pascal and to the "Maxims" of La Rochefoucauld. If the "Characters" is well known, so much cannot be said of its author; he conceals himself in his work, and does not, like Montaigne in his admirable Essays, make the reader familiar with him. "One knows nothing, or next to nothing, of the life of La Bruyère," said Sainte-Beuve in 1836. Since that date, a few discoveries have been made by MM. Walckenaer, Destailleur, Jal, Chatel, Edouard Fournier. M. Servois gives us a biographical essay on his author, which forms a thin volume annexed to his collection.

Jean de la Bruyère was born in Paris, in what is called the Cité, near Notre Dame and the Hôtel-Dieu. He was baptized, probably the day after his birth, on the 17th of August, 1645. His father was not a nobleman; he was controller-general of the *rentes* of the Hôtel de Ville (the *rentes* of the city of Paris). He styled himself in the notarial documents as "noble homme," but this was a proof of commonality, not of nobility. Some of his ancestors were ardent members of the Ligue. This is what De Thou says of the foundation of this famous association: "Principium Lutetiae factum, ut primaria urbs ceteris toto regno exemplo suo praeiret; ubi, instigantibus, inter alios, Petro Bruerio (La Bruyère) seplasiario ac Matthia ejus filio praefecti parisiensis assessore, huic foederi certatim perique, qui vita per infamiam in olea et lustris acta decoxerant, nomen dederunt" ("Thuanii Historiarum," liber lxiii.). The elder La Bruyère, mentioned by De Thou, became a member of the "Conseil des Seize"; his name is found among the signers of many letters addressed to the Pope or to the King of Spain. The two La Bruyères of the Ligue are chargeable with complicity in the events of November 15, 1591, on which day Brisson, the first president of the Chamber, and two Councillors were hung. The meetings of the Sixteen which preceded the murder took place in their house. Their importance ended with the power of the Sixteen; they became exiles, and took refuge at Antwerp or at Brussels, where Mathias published in 1603 a 'Rosary of the Virgin Mary.' He was suspected of having taken part in various plots against the life of Henri IV. From Brussels Mathias went to Naples, where we lose trace of him.

Guillaume de La Bruyère, the grandfather of the moralist, was not very proud of his family. He was the modest secretary of the Bishop of Paris. He waited a long time before he bought the place of cabinet secretary to the King. He left two sons and a daughter. Louis, one of the sons, married the daughter of a *procureur* at Châtelet, and had for his eldest son the author of the 'Characters.' He was himself, as I have said, controller-general of the *rentes* of the Hôtel de Ville; he was not rich, and, with the dower of his wife, had only a capital of 12,000 francs; with the interest of this sum and his salary he had to educate eight children. Fortunately, his brother John, who was in better circumstances, lived with him, and helped him to keep house. We don't know what John's profession was; M. Servois suspects that he was a contractor in some *ferme* of the state. It is probable that La Bruyère never left Paris during his youth. At the age of twenty he passed his examinations in law before the University of Orleans (which university, with that of Poitiers, could then alone teach the civil law). His thesis was entitled "De Tutelis et Donationibus." He was admitted, and returned immediately to his home in the Rue Grenier Saint-Lazare.

He lost his father in 1666, and his uncle four years afterward. This uncle had more than 100,000 livres—a great sum for the time. He used silver at table, not pewter; he kept a coach. He left the greater part of his fortune to his brother's children. La Bruyère found himself in possession for several years of his uncle's carriage and horses. His second brother, Louis, four years younger than himself, took the paternal office of receiver of *rentes*, and married, in 1682, a distant relation of Boileau. The two brothers continued to live together. La Bruyère had become a lawyer, but he had no success at the bar; he was too shy, too meditative, too full of perplexities. After eight years at the bar in the Parlement of Paris, in 1693 he became treasurer-general of France at the finan-

cial bureau of the *généralité* of Caen. Having taken the oath at Caen, after the usual fashion, he returned to Paris, and never went back to the bureau. The permission to remain in Paris was granted to whoever had a court office. Racine was a treasurer like La Bruyère, but never discharged the duties of the office. It is not known upon what pretext La Bruyère could remain absent from Caen.

The title of treasurer, which he held for twelve years, and which changed nothing in the routine of his life, had made him, from a bourgeois of Paris, an *écuyer*, a nobleman. He lived like a philosopher, with his books, in the midst of his family. For reasons which are unknown to us, he renounced his independence in 1684, and took a position among the professors who had to finish the education of the grandson of the great Condé. Bossuet was generally consulted as to the choice of these professors, and it was under his auspices that La Bruyère entered the house of "Monsieur le Prince," as he was always called.

The young Duke of Bourbon, his pupil, had just finished his second year of philosophy at the College of Clermont (which soon afterward was called Collège Louis-le-Grand). He had been brought up by the father Jesuits; the Jesuits had also educated his father at Namur, his grandfather at Bourges. The young Prince was somewhat spoiled by the flattery of his masters; he is represented in some confidential letters of his governor to his father as despotic, "quarrelsome, violent, insolent toward his inferiors, extremely childish and frivolous." The education of the college had not been good for him. La Bruyère entered on his new functions on the 15th of August, 1684, with a salary of 1,500 livres a year. His duty was to teach history, geography, and French institutions; the mathematician Sauveur was to teach geometry and fortification. The young Prince was sometimes with his father, who was called Monsieur le Duc, and sometimes with his grandfather, Condé, at Chantilly. The young Prince was himself called the Duc de Bourbon, and was presented at court. He was to have his own household, but Louis XIV., who regulated all such details, gave him a *premier écuyer*, M. de Saintrailles, colonel of the Enghien regiment, thus saving a governor, a first gentleman of the chamber, and a captain of Guards. Louis XIV. also wished to know the names and conditions of all the preceptors. Two Jesuits, by the desire of Condé, remained with the two lay preceptors, Fathers Alleaume and Du Rosel.

Condé took a great interest in the studies of his grandson, and the preceptors wrote constantly to him. La Bruyère tells him what his method is in two lines: "I will always see that he takes from our studies what is the least *épineux* [thorny], and what is most suitable to the great prince." The correspondence of La Bruyère with Condé leaves, however, distinctly the impression that the professor was tired of the inattention and levity of the pupil. Condé does his best—he tries to help the conscientious master; but La Bruyère, having not much satisfaction in his pupil, found no consolation in the frivolous and worldly company in which he had to live. Knowing his own merit, a bourgeois of yesterday, he had to deal with the father of his pupil, who was the most fantastic and terrible of men. The violence of the Condés, which no longer found a noble employment on the battlefield, was now spent in miserable domestic affairs and on innocent people like the timid La Bruyère. La Bruyère did not know how to do things by halves; he had a morbid conscientiousness; he fatigued and disgusted his pupil with his lessons. Too timid in the routine of life, La Bruyère was not timid enough in his

teaching. He was bold enough to read the 'Principles' of Descartes to the young Prince, and to make comments on a book which was condemned by the Jesuits. He did it at Versailles, under the eyes of the two Jesuits. To be sure, he had the great Condé on his side, as Condé was a philosopher; he had also Bossuet, who heard his commentaries on Descartes' philosophy with pleasure.

The last letter which has been preserved of La Bruyère's to Condé bears the date of the 4th of July, 1686. Condé died on the 11th of December. His death changed everything, and put an end to the mission of La Bruyère. His pupil became in his turn Monsieur le Duc, while the father of his pupil became Monsieur le Prince. La Bruyère remained, however, in the household, in the quality of a man of letters, with a pension of 1,000 livres. He was styled "gentleman of M. le Duc." He was probably a librarian, and at times a secretary. He certainly must have regretted deeply the great Condé. He shows in his 'Characters' the most sincere admiration for the hero of Rocroi; but his new masters had none of the qualities of Condé. Saint-Simon has left their portraits, and it is impossible that some of the traits of the 'Characters' should not have been inspired by sentiments which were not much different from those of Saint-Simon.

We must repeat here what Saint-Simon says of La Bruyère himself: "The public has lost (in 1696) a man illustrious by his *esprit*, by his style, and by his knowledge of men—I mean La Bruyère, who died at Versailles of apoplexy, after having surpassed Theophrastus, who first was his master, and having depicted the men of our time in his new 'Characters,' which have an inimitable manner. He was, besides, a very honest man, good company, simple, without any pedantry, and very disinterested." The Abbé d'Olivet, in his 'Memoirs,' speaks of him as a philosopher who was content to live quietly with his friends and his books, who chose them both well, who feared every kind of ambition, even the ambition of showing too much *esprit*. If we judge him by the 'Characters' alone, we find not so much severity in the man; we see him at times very passionate, full of a concentrated and deep passion, angry with the men who surround him, disgusted with their follies, their vices, their vanity. His characters are all portraits, it can be safely asserted, and in some cases it can be proved. What a gallery! what a terrible and eloquent protest against a whole generation of men. There is more life in Saint-Simon; more sadness in La Bruyère. Saint-Simon is more dramatic; he carries us with him into the very midst of events and of men. With La Bruyère we see things from above, and we perceive the great currents which lead a country and an age to its ruin.

Correspondence.

ETHAN ALLEN'S BIRTH YEAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your comments last week on Mr. Leslie Stephens's tentative list of names for his new "Dictionary of National Biography," you say he has "adopted 1742 as Ethan Allen's birth-year, but 1737 and 1739 are given by other authorities." According to the town records of Litchfield, Conn., his birthplace, Ethan, son of Joseph and Mary (Baker) Allen, was born January 10, 1737-38. He was the eldest child of his parents, who removed to Cornwall, Conn., when he was about two years old.

JOHN D. CHAMPLIN, JR.

NEW YORK, February 21, 1883.

POPULAR SCIENCE IN THE COUNTRY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: Those who are confined to the close quarters of the city, and have to depend for their scientific instruction and entertainment on the limited range afforded by occasional lectures from such men as Professor Marsh or Professor Tyndall, may fail to realize the liberal opportunities of some of our Western localities. Dr. —, for example, is giving a series of Sunday evening discourses from his pulpit in Akron, Ohio, one of which is reported in the *Akron Daily Beacon* of February 14. (We cannot answer for the correctness of the report.) His subject was "The Creation," and his laudable purpose seems to have been to "justify the ways of" Moses "to man." If the newspaper report is to be trusted, the following is the substance of a part of this "most interesting discourse":

"In that period, science has shown, great land and sea whales, with monstrous serpents and smaller animals, as well as winged, web-footed fowls filled the earth, air, and seas. Skeletons of animals and monsters are in the great museums of the world, showing the huge and bulky creatures of that age. They roamed over the earth and ploughed through the seas, tyrants and kings of all the earth. It was shown that at St. Louis there is one of those ancient specimens, so large that a man can stand erect and walk down the throat of the animal into its stomach, which is as large as a common bedroom. Other specimens were referred to, 120 feet long. These animals had great mouths, and a full-sized ox would make but a single bite. It was shown that these creatures were so abundant that from their fat and substance have come the great oil deposits of the earth, as the vegetable growth formed the vast coal beds. God's goodness was shown in providing in that far-off age for the people of to-day. What a sight it would be to-day to see animals large as a steamboat roaming over the earth, browsing off the tops of the highest trees! If such creatures lived—and science shows they did—it is no wonder that the earth is full of crude, strong-smelling fat."

No wonder, indeed! The only room for surprise is in the fact that so little now remains of these disagreeable and malodorous remains. Is there not, we would timidly inquire of the Rev. Dr.—may there not be at least—something providential in that? What if these terrific animals had been still more abundant, and, finding plenty of "full-sized oxen" for their occasional "single bites," had deposited their "Oriental fragrances" in the strata beneath every rural gentleman's garden? How truly painful it would have been to any sensitive mind to purchase some modest patch of ground for a suburban residence, and on digging the cellar to come plump into the "crude and strong-smelling" reminiscences of a former occupant of the size of a Cunarder! Most providential it is, indeed, that we are spared this painful experience, unless it may occasionally occur in Akron, Ohio.

The reporter goes on to promise the public that "two more Sundays will be given to the earth and its creatures before Adam came and found all complete. It will well pay the time spent to hear the story of Moses and the scientific facts laid alongside and compared."

"At the conclusion of the Doctor's discourse," we are gratified but not surprised to learn, "that grand chorus from 'The Creation,' 'The Heavens are Telling the Glory of God,' was rendered with thrilling and magnificent effect."

E. R. S.

HARVARD COLLEGE AND DR. BUTLER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: At the dinner of the Harvard Club of New York, on the 21st inst., frequent reference was made to the ludicrous position in which the authorities of the University would be placed in being called upon to confer the degree of LL.D. upon the present Governor of Massachusetts.

Whether there is a rule or custom requiring such a step on the part of these learned men or not, I do not know; but it is quite certain that it will not be by any means the first time they have occupied just such a position in the matter of conferring this degree. Again and again they have bestowed it on men whose only possible qualification for it was their high official station, at which they had arrived in many cases by the vicious methods in use among machine politicians, and which they filled with little or no ability or merit.

Does this high-sounding degree, then, mean anything? If so, what? Does it imply learning, intellectual power, or statesmanship? Or is it simply the tribute which Harvard University pays to "the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker" who happens also to be a smart and successful politician? What sort of civil-service reform is the University teaching? "Get yourself elected President or Governor, no matter how—and no matter how you perform the duties of your office—and we will crown your successful efforts with our highest degree."

Looking at the long line of learned Doctors created within the last few years, the men of Harvard may rest assured that the Governor of Massachusetts will play his part in their annual farce quite as respectably as most of those who have heretofore been invested with this great honor. Perhaps he may say (because, as we all know, he is a humorous man) that Harvard University has discovered a very good way of making really great men "small by degrees," if not "beautifully less."

ANTI-BUTLER (Harvard, '63).

LOWELL, Feb. 26, 1883.

SOUTHERN HOMICIDE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: For a number of years I have been a reader of the *Nation*. It and the *State*, of Richmond, Va., are the only papers which I now see regularly. I have just read the issue of the 18th of January of the *Nation*; the *State* of the 1st instant had been read previously. In this number of the *Nation* so much has been said, and well said, by the correspondents as to the general accuracy of the statements made by the *Nation* in reference to social homicide in the South, and the causes which have produced and still perpetuate the present unfortunate state of affairs, and by the *Nation* itself as to the means which should be used to put a stop to it, that I shall not attempt to improve upon the one, nor further confirm the other; but only beg to offer a word of encouragement in this disagreeable effort to rid our system of the lead and iron, the probing for which is naturally so painful to the patient.

While not ready to insulate the *Nation* upon a pedestal of integrity quite so dangerously lofty as "A South Carolinian," nor to do obeisance before it with a reverence quite so profound, still I will say (and I believe I am giving expression to the opinion of the majority of "decent people" in the South—not simply "the best men"—in saying it, although the *Nation* may not think so) that I have always felt truly grateful to the *Nation* for the position it has taken in reference to "troops," "repudiation," and "social homicide," or against Grant, Mahone, and the *State*. I say sincerely, I thank thee that thou art not as other men are *quoad hoc*, or these poor publicans; and I wish the publicans a speedy repentance.

The fathers of the past generation could well say to their sons, when leaving home, "Don't make yourself a fool because you are from Virginia"; but repudiation and social homicide are fast teaching the sons to say, "Don't tell any-

body you are from Virginia." One does not feel specially prone to brag, abroad, of being a fellow-countryman of "Boss Billy," or of the chivalrous participants in "affairs" and defenders of the "knife-and-pistol" solution of petty difficulties. There are two Virginians in this town, at any rate, who keep exceeding dark on that topic just now.

Although I am a friend of the *State*, and "the stock of that shotgun sticking out" had been observed before you called attention to it, still, being at a safe distance, and knowing it to be the *State's* old shotgun, and harmless to riddle burgers or worse knaves than I am, I shall sign my name to this and take the risk, abuse and all.—Yours truly, another renegade,

T. R. SAMPSON.

ATHENS, GREECE, Feb. 6, 1883.

THE "NATURAL METHOD" OF TEACHING LATIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: The correspondence that has appeared in your paper on the subject of the so called "Natural Method of Teaching Latin" has suggested to me to ask for space to point out what appears to me to be the fallacy which underlies the arguments of its advocates.

This method aims at teaching a foreign language, not mediately, through the words and phrases of the learner's native tongue, but by producing, if possible, an immediate and direct association between the foreign word or expression and the thing signified by it. In other words, it aims at repeating the natural process by which the learner originally acquired a knowledge of his native tongue; and this is its great merit in the eyes of its admirers. But these admirers lose sight of the very important difference which distinguishes the mental state of a child when he first begins to learn his native language, from the mental state in which he afterward approaches the acquisition of a foreign language—a difference which constitutes so essential an alteration in the conditions under which nature originally worked as to render a repetition of that process impossible.

When the child begins to pick up his own language, his mind is entirely unoccupied by any verbal symbols whatever, and, impelled by the powerful instinct of association implanted in him by nature, he rapidly and with the greatest ease catches them up from his playmates and guardians, and learns to associate the proper symbols with objects around him. But this state of mind is possible only once in the course of his linguistic experience. Very different is the state of his mind when he comes to learn a foreign language. It is already preoccupied with an extensive scheme of verbal signs, linked by almost indissoluble bonds of the strongest association with the objects and events that present themselves in his daily experience, and it has become impossible for him to begin the task of associating a new set of signs with those objects without the old signs constantly thrusting themselves in between the new signs and the objects they stand for, whether he wish it or not. In other words, the natural instinct now is to associate the new signs directly with the old and familiar signs, and only indirectly with the things signified. The usual method, therefore, of teaching a foreign language by means of and with constant reference to one's native tongue, has a juster claim to be called the "Natural Method" than the method usually so called; and it is the method which has been followed by the most successful teachers of Latin from the days of old Roger Ascham, who, when recommending the master to begin his instructions with the easier letters of Cicero, writes: "First,

let him teache the childe, cherefullie and plainlie, the cause and matter of the letter; then let him construe it into Englishe, so oft, as the childe may easilie carie awaie the understanding of it."

That Latin should be taught by means of, and with constant reference to, one's native English, recommends itself further to our judgment when we consider that in teaching it the chief end aimed at is the acquisition by the pupil of the power of translating accurately and at sight into idiomatic English a passage from a Latin classic, and the further power of rendering into correct and not inelegant Latin a passage from an English classic. Any young man who is master of these accomplishments may congratulate himself on the good use he must have made of a long course of training at the hands of judicious teachers. If he has not acquired the accomplishment of being able to converse in Latin, he can console himself with the very just reflection that to be able to converse in a dead language is, after all, an accomplishment more curious than useful, and that the performance of the best modern adepts in Latin conversation would, it is to be feared, sound sad jargon to the ears of a Terence.

E. HAWKESLEY RHODES,
11 NORFOLK ROAD, LONDON, Feb. 8, 1883.

ARCHÆOLOGY IN GREECE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent, "W. J. S.," is undoubtedly right, from a strictly topographical point of view, when he writes that stone houses are now being built on the northern slopes of the Acropolis; but as yet there is no solid building far enough up on the slopes to interfere with any ancient remains that may exist connected with the Acropolis as such, or to cover any antiquities that may have been thrown down from above. It is safe to say that the slopes of the Acropolis, so far as they have been encroached upon, present no greater interest than any other central portion of the site of ancient Athens.

I am by no means of opinion that such laws relating to the exportation of antiquities as those of Greece are advisable everywhere, or indeed permanently in Greece. Their justification there is that every great civilized country except the United States is already in possession of important remains of Greek art, and that had matters been left to take their course (precisely on account of the feebleness of Greek resources alluded to by "W. J. S.") there would soon have been remains of Greek antiquity everywhere except in Greece. One may well deplore the restriction as a hindrance to the advance of archaeology; but it is difficult not to sympathize with the motive, which is most unjustly stigmatized by "W. J. S." as "the showman's feeling," and to contrast it with the American system of taxing the importation of antiquities and works of art. While all well-informed persons must concur in "W. J. S.'s" views regarding the inestimable profit to Greece and to the world of the transportation to England of the Parthenon marbles at the time when Lord Elgin took them, I cannot but think that now, in these days of easy and rapid communication, those precious heirlooms of Athens would be more useful were they taken from their dingy quarters in London and restored to the Acropolis. They have performed their function of a chief factor in opening the eyes of the world to the preëminence of ancient Greece; and the incalculable gain to civilization thus acquired is the only justification—and although unanticipated, it is ample justification—of the ruthless despoiling of the Parthenon.

Regarding corrupt and inefficient enforce-

ment of any law there can be but one opinion among honorable men the world over. But opposition to temporary and honest enforcement by Greece of her law forbidding the exportation of those memorials of her glorious past that are left to her, must commend itself chiefly to professional dealers in antiquities.

I am, sir, very respectfully,

A MEMBER OF THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL
SOCIETY OF ATHENS.

NEW YORK, February 24, 1883.

Notes.

THE eleventh of Mr. W. M. Griswold's Q. P. Indexes (Bangor, Maine) is 'A General Index to the *Contemporary Review*, the *Fortnightly Review*, and the *Nineteenth Century*,' filling thirty-six pages, and covering the years 1865-82. It is needless to enlarge upon the merits of this key (by author and subject) to the choicest periodical literature for the term indicated. Let it not be forgotten, however, that it is one of a series, and that its value is cumulative, so to speak. Mr. Griswold, placing at the end some justly laudatory remarks on his labors from German sources, reports in a footnote the singular refusal of Mr. F. A. Breckhaus to send him a free copy of *Unsere Zeit* for the purpose of being (gratuitously) indexed. This is indeed shortsighted.

Dr. Holmes precipitates the readers of the new edition of his 'Professor at the Breakfast-Table' (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) by referring to the changes which twenty-five years have made in standards and opinions—instancing the utmost speed of the trotting-horse, and the degree of heresy in a warm Unitarian like himself, of which the one has been heightened and the other significantly lowered. He therefore hopes that "what was once an irritant may now act as an anodyne." The same publishers have brought out a 'Lowell Birthday-Book,' in which there are numerous happy adjustments of selections to the characters whose birthdays are noted on the opposite page, and, it is superfluous to add, a delightful store of wit and wisdom in verse and prose.

"Primers for the People," edited by Eugene L. Didier, and issued by the People's Publishing Co., Baltimore, promise a great deal for a little money—e. g., in No. 6, "A Primer of Criticism," as to certain American writers—"Pre-tentious mediocrity exposed to the sunlight of truth."

Mr. Francis Parkman's pamphlet, 'Some of the Reasons against Woman-Suffrage,' has been reprinted "at the request of an association of women" in and about Boston.

Oliver & Jenkins, New York, publishers of the *Wheel*, will begin next month an illustrated weekly chronicle called the *Amateur Athlete*, similar in size and general appearance to the periodical already mentioned.

Circulars relative to the collection and distribution of astronomical intelligence have been sent out by the Harvard College Observatory since it was made the American centre of such collection and distribution in an international scheme—Kiel being the corresponding European centre. Mr. John Ritchie, jr., has been placed in charge of this service. Observatories and private individuals are admitted to the benefits of the special circulars, or of telegrams at their own expense.

We have received the slip of dates, subjects, and reference lists accompanying the Hopkins Hall lectures of Prof. James A. Harrison, at Baltimore, on Anglo-Saxon Poetry, which terminate to-morrow. Students anywhere would find it a useful guide to texts and general treatises.

In the February *Bibliographer* (J. W. Bouton), Mr. Edward Solly reprints Wagstaffe's list of the various editions of the 'Edkon Basilike,' and indicates some not contained in it, with a view to as perfect an enumeration as possible and a determination of the order. Even the first edition cannot be identified with certainty.

The London *Times* of February 12 gives a tolerably full account of the Ashburnham MSS. which have been offered *en bloc* to the British Museum, and the purchase of which is now under consideration. The collection is in its subdivisions Italian, French, and English, mainly; the first consisting of the so called Libri Collection, with its Pentateuch codex of the seventh century. The English, or Stowe Collection, embraces a volume containing more than forty Anglo-Saxon charters, from the close of the seventh century to the Conquest; ten volumes of "Hanoverian Papers" (the correspondence of the Electress Sophia and her son, afterward George I.); the letters and papers of Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland under Charles II.; the correspondence of various English ambassadors in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., Charles II., and James II.; William and Mary, etc.; the original diary of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, for the year 1688, etc. In respect to the bindings and the illuminations, the Ashburnham MSS. are almost as remarkable as for their contents. The schools of England, France, Germany, Flanders, and Italy are represented.

"A Librarian" asks us to call attention to what is in effect a deception practised on the reading public, and on buyers generally, in the republication, *literatim et punctatim* (without the slightest hint of its being the same book), under the title of 'A Jolly Summer,' with the imprint of 1883, of a book published in 1880 under the title of 'College Tramps; or, Adventures of a Party of Yale Students in Europe.'

In the *American Naturalist* for March, Prof. V. M. Spalding has a suggestive article on "The Plains" of Michigan, meaning the tracts sometimes called "the barrens" in the northern central portion of the lower peninsula of Michigan. They lie in the pine belt, and have small capacities for agriculture, and the writer urges their improvement by the State for tree culture. Circumstances favor their control by the State.

With the March number the new eclectic magazine published at Buffalo, the *Modern Age*, has been enlarged to sixty-four pages. Its aim is to devote more attention to foreign Continental literature than is done by other publications of its kind, and a large proportion of the articles are therefore translations from French and German papers, carefully and neatly done, as far as we have examined them. The March number is very attractive, and contains hardly anything not worth reading. The low price of the magazine is also in its favor.

The *Belletristisches Journal* of this city has issued as a premium for the subscribers to the thirty-second volume a handsome and finely-printed steel portrait of Schiller, as a companion piece to the Lessing, Wagner, and Liszt issued in previous years. The Schiller portrait was engraved after the Dannecker bust by A. Krause, of Leipzig. This paper, by the way, unites some of the best features of German and American journalism. It contains novels and essays by leading German writers, and at the same time covers the fields of American politics, literature, science, and art. The partly humorous account of New York city life from week to week is one of its most readable departments. The editor's letters from the Far West, which began to be printed last summer, would, in book form, make a valuable addition to American tourists' literature.

We have before referred to the reports of the Norwegian "North Atlantic Expedition" on the *Voringen*, directed by Prof. H. Mohn. The last instalment, No. 8 of the *Zoology*, contains the first part of Herman Friele's valuable report on the mollusks, embracing the Buccinidae. This forms a careful monograph of the members of the group native to the northern portion of the North Atlantic, occupying thirty-five quarto pages in parallel columns of Norwegian and English, and illustrated by six excellent plates and a map. Illustrations of the wonderful variability of these arctic forms, perhaps partly due to hybridization, are accumulated, together with a host of valuable and important biographical data on the species, of which several are described as new.

Parts 66-69 of 'Brehm's Thierleben' (chromo edition; B. Westermann & Co.) deals with rodents chiefly. The colored representation of the porcupine must be highly praised as life-like. Among the capital wood-engravings is one of the South American bizacha, not often represented.

No. 102 of the *Zeitschrift* of the Berlin Geographical Society (New York: L. W. Schmidt) contains Dr. Koner's customary exhaustive classification of the geographical literature of the year 1882. The monthly *Verhandlungen* are as usual full of the latest intelligence from the field of exploration.

In No. 2 of the *Naples Esplorazione*, F. Borsari has an historical introduction to what promises to be an extended discussion of the prime meridian and universal time reckoning.

M. Em. Terquem, 15 Boulevard St.-Martin, Paris, began last month the publication by subscription of a 'Bibliographie des Bibliographies,' by M. Léon Vallée, of the National Library. The first part will be an author-catalogue, with complete titles, checked where possible by the works themselves at the compiler's command. The second part is arranged by subjects, with references from the abridged titles to the fuller. The edition will be small; the size of the book, 900 pages 8vo; and the price, 20 francs.

The Brothers Henninger, Heilbronn, Würtemberg, have in press 'Kunstraube: recueil de documents pour servir à l'étude des traditions populaires.'

A farewell dinner was given on February 1 to the Danish author, George Brandes, at Berlin, where he has lived for five years, having left his country as a victim of political persecution. Among the guests and speakers were Rodenberg, Scherer, Spielhagen, Hopfen, Lindau, Gncist, Franzos, Friedrich Kapp, and many other men of letters. A poem by Paul Heyse on Brandes was also read.

In No. 2 of Vol. v. of the *American Journal of Mathematics*, Prof. Sylvester concludes his article—perhaps it would be more proper to say his treatise—"On Subinvariants: i. e., Semi-Invariants to Binary Quantics of an Unlimited Order." Prof. Arthur Cayley, the great English mathematician, contributes "A Memoir on the Abelian and Theta Functions," being a revision and extension of the course of lectures which he delivered last year at the Johns Hopkins University. The scientific and personal relations of Profs. Sylvester and Cayley have been so intimate, and have extended over so long a period, they have so often worked on a subject "jointly and severally," that we presume in many cases it would be impossible for themselves to disentangle and properly assign to each the credit of many of their contributions to science. The mathematical world have come to regard them as a pair of intellectual twin brothers. Mr. W. E. Story finishes the number with a memoir "On the Non-Euclidean Geometry," more especially in its relations to spherical

trigonometry. He had before treated the subject in its relations to plane trigonometry in Vol. iv. (pp. 332-335) of the *Journal*. To all except professional mathematicians, and those, too, of a high order, any attempt to convey a notion of the subjects and objects of these papers would be simply unintelligible. Doubtless they will be read by nearly every one of that not very large class whose mathematical studies have been sufficiently extensive to understand them.

—The late Dr. Leonard Bacon, of New Haven, in the early days of the slavery agitation, proposed to solve the problem through the "Colonization Society," which aimed to take the free and emancipated blacks clean out of the country. He was unable, however, to witness the success of this experiment, because the Society was killed or reduced to insignificance by a tract written by William Lloyd Garrison, and which made much stir at the time, entitled "Thoughts on Colonization." Still, Dr. Bacon did not relinquish the hope of having slavery dealt with in his own way. He attempted, by an organization which fell still-born, to withdraw the support of anti-slavery men from the genuine abolition societies. He even went so far as to oppose the formation of a political party antagonistic to slavery, which he early foresaw and deprecated as an evil, and he joined that party only at the eleventh hour. In fact, his share in the anti-slavery controversy was a portion of his career which we should think his friends or biographers would not care to recall, or at all events dwell upon with any emphasis. We have, therefore, been somewhat surprised to see it brought up in an article, by one of his sons, in the *March Century*, entitled "A Good Fight Ended." It is the more singular because it describes the "fight" as having been directed primarily rather against "the so-called abolitionists than against the advocates of slavery," and suggests that it nevertheless had the curious result of leading to the Emancipation Proclamation, thus furnishing a new key to Alcott's untitled lines—

"Thy trenchant and emancipating pen
The patriot Lincoln snatched with steady hand,
Writing his name and thine on parchment white."

The object of precipitating this controversy is not apparent, unless the article is to be taken as a prospectus or foretaste of the family Memoir now in preparation. If it be this, we shall read with less interest than we now expect to do the chapters narrating Dr. Bacon's part in the good fight at Canterbury, on one side of which was Prudence Crandall and her friends; and at New Haven, over the Manual Labor School for blacks, on one side of which were Simeon Jocelyn and Arthur Tappan.

—Mr. C. F. Holder, in *Lippincott's*, gives an entertaining account of sword-fishing "down East," in which he introduces a sword-fishing captain, whose manner of conversation is too racy and natural to suggest literary invention. Captain Sam's description of his early innocence and inexperience, when he was a "regular high-tide clam-digger, always a' lookin' fur the wind to leeward and the like," his confidential admission, "when I ain't a' talking you'll know I'm sick," and his account of his prudent father's permitting him to take the family schooner and go sword-fishing, because she was "insured and hogged," and many other little touches, will vividly recall to readers who have any knowledge of the New England coast the local skipper. Mr. Alfred M. Williams writes entertainingly on the subject of the Cherokees, who, it seems, in addition to other white habits, have acquired that of running a political convention in the approved white manner. The convention particularly described by Mr. Williams was presided over by the Hon. Pig Smith, who opened the pro-

ceedings with the familiar appeal for "harmony and enthusiasm"; a committee was appointed to nominate another committee to "run" the party for a year, and its report was adopted without debate or division, and so on. Committees have to withdraw for consultation into the thicket, instead of a hotel parlor; but, with the exception of a few little differences like these, caused by a difference of circumstances, and which will doubtless disappear as the thicket is swept away by the tide of civilization, party "politics" among the Cherokees seem to resemble those of the rest of the country. We have no doubt that the Honorable Pig Smith has a "home" in which he "develops strength" from time to time as a candidate for one office or another, and is as gloomy when a want of harmony is displayed in the party as any statesman at Albany. The by-paths of American history occupy all the magazines more or less, and under this head "The Story of the Palatines," the colony from the Lower Palatinate of the Rhine founded on the Hudson, in Queen Anne's time, as told by Mr. Charles Burr Todd, deserves attention, and, for a queer bit of contemporary American life and manners, the account given of the "Polanders" in Texas, by R. L. Daniels, is worth reading. In "Our Monthly Gossip" C. P. W. makes a protest against the abstruse and recondite nature of the subjects to which "intellectual" women devote themselves, and complains that a woman will abandon herself with painstaking assiduity to the study of early Italian art, Eastern mythology, or the categories of Kant, and lapse into "a state of placid speechlessness" if some subject is introduced into conversation like the latest election, the defeat of Arabi, or the Irish troubles. This has been one of the peculiarities of the *femme savante* since the days of Molière, and the type of woman who will discuss matters of the same kind and in the same way that men do—that is to say, the woman from whose conversation, if put in print, you could not tell whether she was man or woman—is still to come. When it does, intersexual sarcasm and humor will be seriously lessened, whatever other effects may be produced.

—A curious tempest in a teapot is now raging in England concerning the merits and demerits of the new American school of international novelists. In the same number of the *Century* in which Mr. Warner made some humorous reflections on the British strawberry, Mr. Howells inadvertently praised the art of Mr. James at the expense of the art of Dickens and Thackeray. No sooner did this reach England than the *World*, after its fashion, and the *Saturday Review* after its fashion, not quite as unlike as might be wished, poured forth the vials of their wrath on the head of Mr. Howells. Close on the heels of the *World* and the *Saturday Review* came a Scotch reviewer in *Blackwood*. By this time very little remained of Mr. Howells and Mr. James, who were reduced to impalpable powder. But worse remained behind. After the weeklies came the monthlies; after the monthlies comes the *Quarterly Review*, and the dust of the pulverized American novelists is rudely scattered to the four winds of heaven. The *Quarterly* article is quite in the old style. It deals freely in invective, in innuendo, and in false statements. It defends the throne and the altar almost in the language of the taproom and the stable. There has been a languid curiosity here to know who it was that was thus annoyed by the success in England of the American novelists. The London correspondent of the New York *Tribune* tells us that the *Quarterly* article was written by Mr. L. J. Jennings, the own and only London correspondent of the New York *World*, formerly the famous vituperative editor of the New York *Times*; and this is rendered probable by the fact

that the London correspondent of the New York *World* telegraphed to that journal that the then forthcoming *Quarterly* would contain a "noteworthy" article attacking the American novelists. He makes one insinuation that is worth notice, which is more than can be said of any of his opinions, and that is, that Mr. James wrote the article on Howells which appeared in the *Century* a few months ago, and that therefore Mr. Howells's notice of James is part of a tit-for-tat arrangement. There is no truth in this whatever, as Jennings must or might have known, because that article was signed by the author, Mr. T. S. Perry.

—It is a very pretty quarrel as it stands, though, unfortunately, quite one-sided, as the American guns after the first shot have been wholly silent. But an unexpected ally has appeared. Just as France fought with us against the British a century ago, so now a French critic comes to succor the American novelist. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for February 1 is begun a series of articles on "Les Nouveaux Romanciers Américains." The first is signed Th. Bentzon, and is devoted to a consideration of the writings of Mr. Howells. It opens with a consideration of the decadence of the novel in England. "It is to America, beyond all doubt, that we owe to-day the best novels written in English; England herself attests this. During the year which has just passed, no book has had the success of 'Democracy'—that brilliant and curious satire of American manners, which only the good nature of a people sure enough of its strength to be ready to learn the truth could make palatable. Translated at once into all languages, 'Democracy' has interested the Old even more than the New World." The critic then cites Mr. Bret Harte's "Flip," "in which a great talent begins to weaken," Mr. Cable's creole stories, and "the profoundly interesting studies of contemporary life in America" by Mr. Howells and Mr. James. The rest of the long essay is taken up with detailed description of Mr. Howells's stories and with highly favorable comment. The whole paper is one to be read with attention by any one anxious to see how an exact and realistic description of American life strikes a clever and highly cultivated Frenchwoman.

—While perfect comity exists to-day between the people of Rhode Island and their neighbors of Massachusetts, the scholars and antiquarians of the two States contrive to perpetuate the historical animosities that grew out of the oppression by "the Bay" of the "Providence Plantations." The two latest issues in the series of "Rhode Island Historical Tracts" (Providence: S. S. Rider) are in evidence. One is a posthumous "Defence of Samuel Gorton and the Settlers of Shawomet," by the late Chief-Justice Brayton; the other, Peter Folger's "Looking-Glass for the Times." Gorton was a man who contrived, without being vicious, to make every community uncomfortable in which he planted himself, and, in spite of his sufferings by persecution, is for the historian a rather humorous figure in the early annals of the colonies. No one can complain of the view of his character taken by such Massachusetts writers (to mention the latest) as Dr. George E. Ellis, in the "Memorial History of Boston," and Mr. S. H. Gay, in "Bryant's History of the United States," and there is perhaps a little unnecessary heat in Mr. Rider's introduction to Judge Brayton's "Defence." This document covers the whole ground, but the arrangement of the narrative and development of the argument are lacking in clearness, and we may suppose that the author had blocked them out for subsequent revision. They do not add much to what was already known. Mr. Rider admits

that the doggerel of Franklin's estimable grandfather Folger has no proper place in his series. It is a protest against Puritan religious intolerance, however, and so far it is in harmony with the other tracts. Moreover, in the following lines we have the key to the treatment of Gorton, whose mystical interpretations of Scripture confirmed the founders of Harvard College in their insistence upon a "learned gospel"—i. e., on insuring against theological vagaries by putting thoroughly trained and educated men, and these only, in the ministry:

"And since that, many Godley Men
have been to Prison sent;

But these Men were, as I have heard,
against our College Men;
And this was out of doubt to me,
that which was most their sin."

—M. Édouard Cuq has read before the Académie des Inscriptions a monograph on the *Consilium Principis*, the Roman Privy Council, tracing its progressive growth and the process by which it gradually absorbed all the power of the Senate and much besides. The study of inscriptions, which has done so much to refashion our knowledge of the orthography and lexicography of the Latin language, has given M. Cuq good results in regard to the Roman jurisprudence and statecraft. He has been able to trace the formal constitution of the Consilium back of Constantine, where it was previously supposed to stop, at least as far as to Hadrian. In his reign the body which started in the reign of Augustus as a mere private convenience of the Emperor—a council of war on a peace footing—appears with a complete organization and regular officers. M. Cuq refers to a number of cases submitted to its jurisdiction, and asserts that we can follow the discussions that arose among its members, and trace the motives that influenced the Emperors to this or that decision. One of the most important of its functions was that of a High Court of Justice. Under Augustus judgments were still given by private judges chosen by the parties themselves, and there was no appeal. In the third century of our era all justice was administered by delegates of the Emperor, and there was an appeal in all cases to the Consilium Principis, then called the Consistorium. How this complete and most momentous change was brought about is partly set forth in M. Cuq's memoir, and is to be explained in full in a volume which he is preparing. The memoir is chiefly concerned with one feature, the rise and extension of the right of appeal, a right which greatly increased the power of the Emperors. The original Roman law admitted appeal in one case only, that in which a judge had delegated his powers, when the decision of his subordinate was always subject to his revision. In order to be able to intervene in judicial decisions it was necessary for the Emperors to create and multiply cases in which magistrates could be considered as their delegates, and this they did so successfully that they had absorbed the whole administration of justice, as we have seen, in criminal matters by the time of Septimius Severus, and in civil matters by the third century. The originality of M. Cuq's investigation may be judged by this, that though Consilium Principis and Consistorium both appear in the Latin dictionaries, so little definite was known about the body that neither word was judged worthy of admission into Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities."

—Prof. Tyrrell has collected in a sumptuous volume, under the title, "Dublin Translations into Greek and Latin Verse," the Greek and Latin verses that have appeared before in the *Hesperidum Susurri* and in that famous college magazine, the *Kottabos*, to which we owe,

among other charming things, the application of the solar myth to Max Müller's personality. The volume is a distinct offset to the 'Arundines Cami,' 'Sabrine Corolla,' and similar collections made on the other side of St. George's Channel, and the Dublinity of the pieces is insisted on with unnecessary vehemence. The Celtic light can not be hid under the bushel of English names. It is sure to burn through, and he who has been privileged to worship the *genius loci* does not need to be told that these poems come from the quick brain of Trinity College. Detailed criticism would be out of place except in a classical journal, and even there these verses ought not to be taken too seriously. Much will depend on the mood in which they are approached. If one is in a good humor and disposed to be amused, there is a certain amount of jocularity to be got out of Latin mummeries of 'Old Father William' and 'Billy Taylor,' Thackeray's "Three Sailors," and Hood's "Bachelor's Dream"; while Prof. Tyrrell's Tennyson in the manner of Theocritus, and Shakspeare in the manner of Plautus, and Prof. Palmer's Catullian "Sally in our Alley" show a surer touch and give a higher pleasure. But if one should not be in a good humor, and should unluckily open the volume at page 233, where a wretched English version of Goethe's "König von Thule" has been rendered into a wretched cento of Homeric verses, in which ignorance of Homeric grammar is matched by ignorance of Homeric archaeology—in such a case it might be possible to say harsh things about an exercise which is too apt to degenerate into parody and pedantry. In the true Irish spirit, some of these elegant scholars have laid sundry traps for the unwary, and evidently take a genuine delight in such classic "April fools" as dubious quantities and hard readings; but there is a Nemesis that overtakes all such jesters, and the volume is not free from hopeless grammatical blunders and versification that would not pass muster in climes far less favorable to classical study than are the banks of the Liffey. Still, the book is brimful of cleverness, as might have been expected, and point and pathos peep out of every corner. The titles alone are studies. For specimens the *Nation* has no space, and can only give Mr. Tyrrell's epigram addressed to Mr. Matthew Arnold, although that too is marred by an erratic quantity, which can only be defended by indifferent authority from the Anthology:

"ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος οὐ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἀνδρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄνθρωπος."

DRESSER'S JAPAN.

Japan: Its Architecture, Art, and Art Manufactures. By Christopher Dresser, Ph.D., F.L.S., etc. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1882.

MR. DRESSER states in his preface that his excuse for adding to the number of our books on Japan is that he writes as a specialist. He says truly that although we have heard much of the manners and customs of the Japanese, and of the aspect of their country, we have hitherto known little of their architecture, and of the relation of their minor arts to it. He therefore attempts to explain the origin and the present forms of the architecture, and how these present forms have resulted from climatic and religious influences; also, how the character of the ornamentation bears evidence of similar influences. The book is divided into two parts, in the first of which an interesting account of the curious sights, peculiar customs, and religious ceremonies which present themselves to the traveller in Japan, is coupled with observations on what pertains more strictly to the main theme; while the second treats of

the architecture and other arts of the people. In this second part the author begins with a brief consideration of the two religions which exist in Japan—the Buddhist and the Shinto; and he finds that these have supplied respectively the two fundamental impulses which have given the art its character—namely, the love of nature and the spirit of conscientiousness of workmanship. The Buddhist “will not destroy an insect or injure the smallest created thing,” and he has a peculiar regard and affection for the beauty of these things, and for flowers and shrubs; while in the Shinto religion “the mirror is said to symbolize the manner in which actions and thoughts should be open and visible.” Hence the constant use of natural forms in Japanese art, and the thoroughness of work and perfection of finish even in hidden members of architecture, and on the insides and the bottoms of their various objects of manufacture.

In the view of some able scholars of art it is considered that the Japanese modes of building are such as hardly to rank properly under the head of architecture, partly on account of its openness and the want of fixed foundation, and partly on account of its want of constructive character. The first of these reasons for this view seems not to occur to Mr. Dresser, and against the second he contends—showing that building in Japan affords instances of some curious and highly ingenious constructive devices, especially in the pagoda, where the enormous upright central pillar, which to the superficial eye appears to rest upon the ground and to stiffen and support the successive stories, is in reality hung from the top, the lower end being held several inches from the ground, like the clapper of a bell, so that in times of earthquake it may swing back and forth, and thus by its weight keep the centre of gravity within the base of the tower. Such devices are admirably suited to the conditions that have to be met, no doubt; but there is yet force in the objection that Japanese architecture is not generally based upon entirely sound constructive principles—that the constructive sense of the Japanese is somewhat deficient. For instance, on page 148 (Fig. 47) Mr. Dresser gives an interior view of the roof of a temple, showing a mode of construction, said to be very common, where “double king-posts” are employed. Now, if these are so framed as to depend from the rafters and uphold the sagging tendency of the tie-beam, then they are indeed true king-posts. But they have not the appearance of being so; they appear rather as pillars set upon the horizontal beam to sustain the purlins carrying arched rafters. We suspect that this last is the actual construction, and if it is so the structure must depend for its security entirely upon the massiveness of the timbers; and the fact that these timbers are very massive—especially the horizontal beams upon which the so-called king-posts rest—tends to confirm this suspicion. A further indication of the want of constructive sense is afforded by the arrangements of shelves and the manner of supporting them in many Japanese cupboards and cabinets. In these one shelf is often made to rest upon a single slender upright member rising from a shelf below, with nothing whatever to support this lower shelf and its superincumbent weight at the point, or near the point, where the weight falls (see Fig. 106). The strength of such a piece of work depends wholly upon that of the material used and upon a system of grooving and dovetailing, in which methods of joining wood the Japanese are wonderfully ingenious and skilful. But although Japanese building seems often to violate constructive principles, it is yet very curious and interesting in many ways, and especially so, as we have already seen in the case of the pagoda, in its adaptation to meet the earthquake shocks with which the

country is frequently visited. Mr. Dresser shows that a house in Japan consists essentially of little more than a roof supported upon upright posts resting loosely upon flat stones; the whole structure being so framed together that in times of earthquake it may freely rock and shift about, as one may cause a chair to do upon an even floor, without harm.

As the temples of Egypt are supposed to have had their prototypes in the reed dwellings of the primitive times, so Mr. Dresser looks for the origin of Japanese forms of building among the abodes of the early Japanese people; and he finds among the present Aino inhabitants of the northern island (Yesso), a people who retain very primitive habits, forms of building which seem to lend plausibility to this theory. Upon this original prototype various outside influences have been brought to bear. The Chinese, the Koreans, and the Buddhist missionaries from Central Asia brought each some new elements of style to Japan. The form of roof seems to have been first derived from that of the rudely thatched Aino Temple, and to have been afterward modified by the Chinese tent-like form—a pole, like the ridge-pole of a tent, with rafters bent in correspondence with the sagging of tent canvas, being characteristic of many Japanese roofs. In the course of his remarks upon the ornamentation of buildings the author reiterates a theory which has found favor in some quarters—namely, that structure must not be falsified by enrichment, and that structural members should be rendered prominent by color and ornamentation. We do not consider this a true theory. We should not, indeed, contend that structure might rightly be falsified; but in our view it may, with perfect propriety, be concealed, as it verily is in a vast number of the noblest architectural monuments in the world. And these monuments frequently also contradict the assertion that structural members should be rendered prominent by color and ornamentation—as, notably, in the case of the Parthenon. Moreover, the theory seems wholly to conflict with the principles of decoration in nature.

From the consideration of architecture and ornament Mr. Dresser passes to the subject of drawing and painting, illustrating this portion of his work by a series of woodcuts, executed in Japan, which form a very interesting and attractive feature of the book. Attention is called to the remarkably living character of the Japanese renderings of the forms of birds, animals, and plants. With however few strokes a creature is drawn, its life is unmistakably and admirably expressed. European artists have only in exceptional cases shown the capacity of thus entering into and representing the life of the lower orders of animal being; as compared with the drawings of the Japanese, their creatures are apt to convey more or less suggestion of stuffed specimens. Japanese graphic art is, however, singularly limited. It is never more than sketching. They know nothing of chiaroscuro, and finished forms of painting do not exist in Japan. Moreover, they show a strange incapacity to draw the human figure or the figures of the higher animals with any dignity or truth. Men and horses are generally conceived by them in repulsively grotesque forms—more or less like the representation of the “God of Wisdom” (Fig. 146 in this book).

The account given of the method of drawing with the brush held at arm's length is suggestive and instructive; but some remarks upon the character of angularity in Japanese drawing lead the author into too sweeping and short-sighted generalizations respecting the value of angularity as a method. He says (p. 286), “Rounded lines, if used in a sketch, generally produce feebleness of effect; whereas, angularity in draw-

ing gives vigor and life.” Now, this is a profoundly untrue and misleading statement. Rounded lines by no means necessarily produce feebleness of effect, nor is angularity any more expressive of vigor and life than it is of the opposite of these. Indeed, a moment's attention will show, we think, that the angularity of the example (Fig. 125, which is especially praised for this quality) has a precisely opposite effect from that which our author supposes, and that what life there is in the drawing is secured wholly by the character of the curves. In the leaves of the plant represented in this figure, the curves of nature are, in many places, reduced to sharp angles, and the effect produced is really as if the leaves were broken. Of course, where any tendency to angularity occurs in living objects, the expression of life requires the due rendering of this quality as much as that of curvature. But this is very different from changing the curves themselves into angles. In nature, angles are constantly associated with curves, and if this fact is overlooked, and curves are given in place of the angles, feebleness will result in the drawing, it is true. A tendency thus to overlook the angles by which nature's curves are foiled has been common with weak draughtsmen, and this practice may well be spoken against; but, by the theory of Mr. Dresser, the fault is not corrected; another fault is simply introduced. That is, where in the one case the angles of nature are rendered by curves, in the other the curves of nature are rendered by angles.

This mistaken theory about angularity is a somewhat common one. It has grown out of a comparatively recent Continental method of elementary instruction in drawing, where curves are resolved into systems of right lines and angles as a means of making them more tangible to beginners. The method has gradually crept up into the more advanced practice of art students and artists. It is a good method if not carried too far, but it is carried too far when angularity is regarded as a permanent substitute for curvature. When the method is rightly employed, the right lines and angles are used in order that the true character of the curves may be more surely attained—that is, they are used *for the sake of the curves*. But the method is wrongly employed when the curves of nature are sacrificed to it. The fallacy of our author's dictum on this point may be further shown by a consideration of the character of delineation among the Greek and Italian designers. With them there are no instances of the slightest approach to this angular method. On the contrary, they draw everything that in nature is curved in “rounded lines,” the vigor and life of nature being expressed, in the only way that they really can be, by strict attention to the varying characters of the curves (compare Fig. 125 with any photograph from a drawing of plant form by Leonardo da Vinci). An examination of the vast collection of Greek vases in the British Museum, and of the drawings by the old masters in Florence, will show that this is absolutely so. Allied to the method of reducing curved lines to angular ones in drawing, is that of reducing curved surfaces to planes in sculpture. This also may be useful during the progress of a work; but it may be instructive to consider that the example of the great sculptors of the past lends no support to it. The various unfinished marbles of Michael Angelo in Florence, for instance, show that he never “blocked out” his work in that way, but that he even rough-hewed the stone in rounded masses.

Mr. Dresser has an instructive chapter on “Analogies and Symbols,” in which he discusses the question of the derivation of ornamental styles, and makes some good remarks about the value of decorative forms as means of arriving at more exact knowledge respecting the affinities

of races. And there are several chapters on the manufacture of Japanese lacquer ware, pottery, metal work, and textile fabrics. The volume is a square octavo, and is handsomely printed.

MORISON'S MACAULAY.—II.

Macaulay. By J. Cotter Morison. [English Men of Letters Series.] London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: Harper & Bros.

MR. MORISON'S original, subtle, and profound criticism of Macaulay has rendered one great service to all intelligent readers: it has clearly defined the true issues which must be decided before a settled opinion can be formed on Macaulay's place in literature. These issues are, to state the matter broadly, twofold:

First. Did Macaulay succeed in carrying out his own idea of the task to be performed by an historian? His conception of his work is in the main clear. He was, above all things, a man of letters. Literature was the art to which he was devoted with passion; history was to him the grandest and most impressive branch of literature. History was, in his judgment, the narration of past events. That man was the greatest and most perfect historian who could tell the tale of the past at once with such truth and with such force of imagination as to bring the story of bygone ages actually before the eyes of modern readers. The historian was an artist engaged in painting a series of literary pictures which differed from the creations of the historical novelist in the fact that they were true, and, because of their truth, surpassed the interest of the most interesting romance. In this point of view, the passage from Macaulay's letters which has made a far too unfavorable impression upon Mr. Morison has great importance:

"I have at last begun my historical labors. . . . The materials for an amusing narrative are immense. I shall not be satisfied unless I can produce something which shall for a few days supersede the last fashionable novel on the tables of young ladies."

Remember that this language is used in the letter to a friend; it has, and is intended to have, a tone of epistolary *badinage*. You must not take a joke seriously. When these allowances are made, it is easy enough to see that Macaulay's language conveys in a light form his conviction that truth properly told was full of interest, and that he possessed the power to tell the tale of English greatness so that it should entrance others as it had throughout his life entranced himself. This was the aim of his labors. It is, we think, impossible to read either Macaulay's works or Mr. Morison's criticisms without seeing that in the main Macaulay succeeded in the attainment of his object. The worst defect which, from his own point of view, can be fairly laid to his charge is excessive diffuseness. He assuredly planned an edifice which under no possible circumstances could he have brought to completion. This want of the power duly to measure out his work is characteristic of the generation among whom Macaulay lived. It is due, no doubt, in a measure to his overweening desire that his narrative should be absolutely clear and intelligible to every reader. Still, make what excuses one will, a tendency to diffuseness is a charge from which Macaulay cannot be acquitted. But the other accusations pressed by Mr. Morison—namely, want of generalized and synthetic views and deficiency in the historical spirit—are rather charges against Macaulay's whole theory of history than just criticisms on the mode in which that view is carried into execution.

"He has not," Mr. Morison urges, "grasped and reproduced in well-weighed general propositions the import and historical meaning of the Stuart period, which was his real object: he

has painted many phases of it with almost redundant fulness, but he has not traced the evolution of ideas and principles which mark its peculiar character."

These remarks are in themselves perfectly just. There is more to be learned about the "evolution of ideas and principles" from sixty pages of Gneist's 'Englisches Verwaltungsrecht' than from the whole of Macaulay's five volumes. But Macaulay's object was not the same as the object of Gneist. A picture is a good thing, and so also is a map; but it is vain to complain that a splendid picture has not the merits of a map. So, again, with regard to the censure on Macaulay for constantly comparing the past with the present. Such comparisons have in his writings a distinct aim: their object is to make the past intelligible to modern readers. There is no more effective way of achieving this end than by contrasting things as they were with things as they now are. To tell us that in Tunbridge Wells "we see a town which would a hundred and sixty years ago have ranked in population fourth or fifth among the towns of England; the brilliancy of the shops and the luxury of the private buildings far surpass anything that England could then show"—is surely to convey in a vivid manner real and valuable information. It impresses on even the most careless student the fact that the England of Cromwell and of the Stuarts was a country of what we should now call small towns and scanty population. That this was so, no one can doubt; but there is probably not one in a thousand readers who does not constantly require to have brought home to him in a form which he can neither misunderstand nor forget, how different was the England of the seventeenth century from the England of to-day. Mr. Disraeli was a man not wanting in intelligence. When an opponent asked, "Where are now the thousands of freeholders who came from Buckinghamshire at the call of Hampden?" Mr. Disraeli retorted, "They are where I should expect to find them—in Buckinghamshire"; and if the Tory leader was not imposed upon by his own smartness, his followers certainly thought the reply conclusive. They never reflected for a moment that the men who rallied round Hampden were a very different class and of very different political weight from the freeholders whom Mr. Disraeli found it convenient to treat as their representatives.

Secondly. What was the worth of Macaulay's conception of history? On the answer to this inquiry the battle between Macaulay's assailants and his admirers will ultimately have to be fought out. The reaction against Macaulay is mainly due to the growth and prevalence of two views of history which are radically opposed to, or at least essentially different from, the conception of history adhered to by the last, and all but the greatest, of historical narrators.

Carlyle and his school have (consistently enough with their general views of life) treated history as, so to speak, a branch of ethics. No doubt Carlyle's 'French Revolution' is as brilliant a piece of imaginative painting as has ever been produced. But no one can believe that Carlyle's main object was to produce a narrative of the events about which he writes. His true, one might almost say his avowed, aim was to take the Revolution as a text from which to preach the truths or dogmas of which he was the prophet. No reader can forget the time when he first read the description of Louis XV.'s death: it is, in its way, the grandest historical sermon ever preached. But it is, after all, a splendid sermon, not a chapter of history. Now, Macaulay is fond, and a good deal too fond, of certain kinds of exposition; his whole genius is that of a narrator. He tells his

tale for the sake of telling it. He has no new morality, no truths, to preach; and students whose real interest in historical study is not the knowledge of facts, but the supposed lessons to be drawn from them, are indignant when an historian persists in keeping to his duty as a narrator, and does not assume the attitude of a moral teacher. Yet, can any one who really cares for the progress of knowledge doubt that Macaulay's treatment of history is, to say the least, far more sound and healthy than the mode in which it is treated by Carlyle? The first requisite for successful research, in whatever field, is, that it should be disinterested; and the author who surveys the annals of mankind in order to find texts in support of a theory will, no doubt, find texts enough. But he is very fortunate if he finds anything else, and it is all but certain that he will misunderstand the texts themselves. Carlyle's 'Cromwell' is probably the contribution of most permanent value made by him to the study of history. The collection, publication, and careful editing of a mass of neglected documents can never fail to promote knowledge. But even now the moralizing and the preaching of the editor might with great advantage be excluded from Carlyle's edition of Cromwell's speeches and letters. If there be anything really unhistorical, it is the encumbering and interlarding of original speeches and writings with editorial comment. Already a good deal of the Carlylean commentary is completely out of date, yet Carlyle was a writer of genius and imagination. One trembles to think what would become of historical study if he had produced, or was likely to produce, a large body of followers. Macaulay may be a mere narrator, but a story-teller who tells truthfully and vividly the transactions of bygone ages is, in the long run, a far more useful guide to the knowledge of the past than can be any moralist, however elevated his doctrine, who is trying to use the past for the purpose of present education and improvement.

If the admirers of Carlyle or Froude find Macaulay deficient in moral tone, earnestness, insight, sympathy, and the like, both Macaulay and Carlyle fail to satisfy critics who look upon history as a branch rather of science than of literature. He has not traced the "evolution of those ideas and principles" which mark the period of the Stuarts with its peculiar character. We have already admitted that this charge is true; we may further admit that Macaulay would have stood in a far higher place than he will ever occupy if he had added to his extraordinary powers of narration that gift of historical analysis or capacity for tracing the evolution of ideas and principles which is exhibited by such writers as Gneist or De Tocqueville. But critics often appear to assert, as Mr. Morison's tone occasionally seems to suggest, that an author who does not trace out the growth of ideas hardly deserves to be called an historian, and certainly has neglected one, if not the chief, of an historian's duties. Now, to the truth of this assertion we distinctly demur. A writer who brings before us a true picture of the past performs a service the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated. Generalizations about the past, the evolution of ideas, the history of the growth of principles, and the like, are in their way things of great interest and importance, but they are almost unmeaning to a student who has not before his mind the facts of the age to which the generalizations refer, or in which the ideas grew up. It would, for instance, be all but impossible for any one to read with profit De Tocqueville's 'Ancien Régime' without some clear conception of the history of France. It would certainly be very unprofitable to read about the growth of ideas under the

Stuarts without some knowledge of the events, say, of the Rebellion and the Restoration. Macaulay, and writers like Macaulay, do not, it is true, explain the past, but, when successful, they do what is even more essential—they show us the past. Nor is narrative of value merely because it enables us to appreciate historical speculation. Theories about history, however ingenious and however profound, are always transitory; they represent the knowledge and ideas of the age in which they grow up. Narrative is, in so far as it is true, the very basis on which such theories of history depend. There is no need whatever to depreciate authors who undertake to analyze the causes which have produced a given state of society. The field of historical investigation has room enough for the employment of every kind of talent. We need investigators, we need critics, we need narrators; each class deserves its appropriate praise. But there is at the present moment some real danger lest the importance of narration should be underrated; and as long as the tendency to such an underestimate of one form of history exists, it is certain that ordinary readers will hardly rate at his full worth the writer whom Mr. Morison has pronounced one of the best, if not the best, of all historical story-tellers.

BOLLES'S FINANCIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Financial History of the United States from 1789 to 1860. By Albert S. Bolles. D. Appleton & Co. 1883.

THE financial history of the United States possesses great interest for all who are disposed to give sober study to economic or political subjects. It is, however, a very difficult subject to treat. The material with which the historian has to deal is very hard and stubborn. If he does not go into a certain detail of dates and figures, he does not fairly state the matter; if he tries to generalize and summarize, he loses the finer traits of the history in which its chief interest and value lie; if he goes into statistical and historical detail, he becomes very dry, and he exhausts the patience of the reader. We had good hopes of Mr. Bolles's second volume. He has, indeed, studied carefully, and he gives the results of his study with fidelity; but he does not seem to us to have hit that proportion of parts of his subject which was desirable, and he has not given to his book the animation which was necessary to render its theme attractive. If we are not mistaken, there are elements of almost romantic interest in the financial history under discussion, but it would require especial tact and skill to bring them out. Mr. Bolles so arranges his essay that he goes over the same ground a number of times—a mode of treatment which must, we think, distract and tire his readers. Under it, the crises of 1819 and 1837 sink into insignificant incidents. Would it not be the true mode of making the subject interesting to hold these two periods as great centres, to and around which the course of events should be traced? We have also been astonished to notice how entirely the Bank of the United States fades into the background, and how, in general, the banking and currency history is made secondary. The story of the Bank of the United States is a drama, almost a tragedy, by itself, and the banking and currency history deserves study, and would excite interest.

Mr. Bolles takes that view of Hamilton and Gallatin which is rapidly winning the suffrages of all modern students of our history. He thinks that Jackson was a mischief-maker. He does not, however, enter into any detail of the political history. His method leads him to neglect the mutual relations of currency and tariff, and

he does not take much notice of the connection of both with politics. Speaking about the most important occasion on which financial legislation reacted on politics—the nullification struggle—he says: “A force bill, as it was called, was speedily enacted; but the South Carolinians, seeing the strong arm of the Government uplifted to vindicate the laws, suddenly changed their purpose, the nullification ordinance was repealed as hastily as it had been passed, and tranquillity was restored.” This cannot be allowed to pass as a correct description of the events to which it refers. It takes no account of the compromise tariff which was passed with the Force Bill, and before the nullification ordinance was repealed.

It is in the case of the history of the tariff, however, that the book has surprised and disappointed us. In the more strictly financial parts of the book we have wondered at the author's selection of topics, and have asked ourselves again and again what had become of those which we regard as of commanding interest. Also, it has seemed to us that, although he had gone over all the ground with fidelity, he had failed to master it; nor do his critical remarks appear to be strong or always correct. But when we come to the tariff, it is evident that the author has not reached a positive conclusion, or else that the limitations of a professor in the Wharton School of Finance and Economy have crippled him to the point of helplessness. To profess a science in a school which has a scientific creed has always been found incompatible with sound scholarship. There is an impression in the minds of many that in Pennsylvania the college trustees find out what is true in political economy, and then hire professors to teach it. We did not suppose that Mr. Bolles was just the kind of man for such a position, but we are shut up, for the explanation of his treatment of an important subject, either to his imperfect mastery of it or to the necessities of his position.

He correctly explains the origin of the tariff in 1789: “Home manufactures were encouraged, not solely to get them cheaper, either immediately or prospectively, but because revenge was sweet, even if purchased at considerable cost to the avenger.” He, however, passes no criticism on this policy of vengeance. He takes no account of the state of the currency under the Confederation, or of the effect which the disordered currency had on trade, and the fallacies about foreign trade to which it gave encouragement. Here and elsewhere the current fallacies about “overtrading” and the balance of trade and the drain of specie are repeated by him as correct and satisfactory explanations of events. “The destruction of our credit, therefore, was a blessing to the home manufacturer.” The manufacturers appear throughout Mr. Bolles's history like the English landowners in the old Corn-Law times—always prospering by the calamities of others, and never able to succeed if other people are well off. On page 86, Mr. Bolles quotes a silly old story about two machines which were bought and carried away by British craft in order to ruin American industry. We do not understand how anybody who has ever studied political economy can believe or seriously repeat such a fiction. It must be that there was no one in Philadelphia patriotic enough, or with business energy enough, to bid up the price and keep the machines. Instead, they raised a wail because there was no law as yet to enable them to raise, by taxes on somebody else, enough to buy the machines and keep them in Philadelphia.

Mr. Bolles regards the embargo and the second war as having been “salutary” in that they forced manufacturing here. How great, then,

would have been our calamity if there had been peace, quiet, and prosperity from 1805 to 1815! He thinks that “auctions” were “the most powerful adverse influence to manufacturing.” He speaks of them as “forcing goods into the market beyond the actual wants of the people” (p. 388). He speaks of “waves” of imports which overwhelmed the American producer in 1817 and 1818. He believes that when the home producer was crushed the foreigner immediately raised the price (p. 369). He repeats the apocryphal quotation of Lord Brougham, that American industries ought to be strangled. He quotes a foolish argumentation of Mallory on the question whether tariff taxes fall on the consumers, and also one of Rush's model sophisms on the question whether tariff taxes raise prices (p. 398). He appears to be satisfied with an argument which he quotes from Appleton to prove that the Southerners did not “exchange cotton for manufactures” (p. 421). He puts himself in the attitude of the manufacturers who pointed to decline in prices as proofs of calamity and bad legislation, although, as above stated, he appears also to side with those who hold that tariffs lower prices (p. 427). To him, therefore, decline in prices under lower taxes seems to prove that the taxes ought to be put on again, not that they never should have been put on. He speaks of the United States as “the emptying-ground for the foreign manufacturer,” who made use of auctions to “push off” his goods (pp. 429, 459). We can understand that the American producer did not like that, and we can see how it was likely to ruin the Englishmen, but the American consumers must have revelled in abundance. He tells us—a fact which we had never known before—that in 1841 the cotton and woollen manufacturers conspired with the New York Custom-house officers “to check importations by increasing the prices of invoices, and seizing goods, and subjecting importers to unexpected annoyances” (p. 431). Hitherto we had heard only of “fraudulent invoices,” etc., devised by importers to defeat the protective system.

Mr. Bolles regards the tariff of 1842 as a model, and boldly faces the problems which his admiration of it arouses. His solution, however, is more trenchant than adequate (p. 446). The tariff of 1846, of course, he regards as a lamentable mistake. He takes no notice of the effect of the repeal of the Corn Laws on this country, although that was undoubtedly the most important event in the history of our tariff, on account of its effect upon the profits of our agriculture, and on the comparative profits of our industries, and on the distribution of our population; but he regards the Irish famine as having been a piece of good luck for us. That, and the discovery of gold in California, which provided means to meet the “drain of specie” to pay for over-importation, saved us from the consequences of our folly in the tariff of 1846.

We can only say that all this seems to us to furnish a striking illustration, how possible it is to study history without learning anything from it.

Oddities in Southern Life and Character. Edited by Henry Watterson. With illustrations. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1883.

THIS compilation from the works of Southern humorous writers has been made with judgment, and was worth making. Its historical value, both in a social and a literary point of view, is considerable, and it will be found interesting even (as in “Major Jones's Travels”) where it is far from being amusing. Every one must admire the exquisite art of “Uncle Remus,” and admit the cleverness of the authors of “Sut Lovingood” and the “Dukesborough Tales,” while Judge Longstreet's “Georgia Scenes”

will always remain a respectable Southern classic. This is but a glimpse of the contents of Mr. Watterson's volume, which does not profess to be encyclopaedic, and yet is liberal enough to include in its selections such waifs as Congressman Knott's famous Duluth speech, Prentice's Louisville-Courier squibs, and the anonymous "Harp of a Thousand Strings." Prefatory notices tell us something of the several writers and of the dates of their works, though less than would content the bibliographer. From these it becomes apparent, before Mr. Watterson points out the curious fact, that Georgia has been more prolific in humorists—and among them the very best—than any other part of the South.

One quickly discovers here the sources of a large share of the Americanisms in Bartlett's Dictionary, and sometimes catches a locution in the very act of forming, as when Davy Crockett says: "Let us hear the colonel," cried another; and so I mounted the stump that had been cut down for the occasion, and began to bushwhack in the most approved style." But, however curious the dialectic peculiarities thus revealed, the social conditions far surpass them in interest. No one can doubt the essential truthfulness of the portraiture of character and manners to which so many writers have contributed, with so much mutual confirmation. We have under observation an agricultural, slaveholding, frontier, land-speculating, and more or less lawless and violent community in the days before the war. The *dramatis persone* are for the most part illiterate, coarse, and, on occasion, brutal. The book opens with the private rehearsal, as an interlude in ploughing, of "all the parts of all the characters in a Courthouse fight," by a youth who "was jist seein' how I could 'a' fout," and this is succeeded by a sickening account of a real encounter between neighborhood bullies. Nothing, again, is more striking than the unconscious incidental record of slaveholding commonplaces. Take, for instance, the sequel to the surreptitious game of cards between Simon Suggs and the colored boy, Bill. The scene is under a mulberry tree (p. 45):

"The old man Suggs made no remark to any one while he was seizing up Bill—a process which, though by no means novel to Simon, seemed to excite in him a sort of painful interest. He watched it closely, as if endeavoring to learn the precise fashion of his father's knot; and when at last Bill was swung up a tip-toe to a limb, and the whipping commenced, Simon's eye followed every movement of his father's arm; and as each blow descended upon the bare shoulders of his sable friend, his own body writhed and 'wriggled' in involuntary sympathy."

Or take this camp-meeting scene (p. 63):

"Dear soul alive! don't he talk sweet?" cried an old lady in black silk. "Whar's John Dobbs? You Sukey!" screaming at a negro woman on the other side of the square, 'ef you don't hunt up your Mass John in a minute, and have him here to listen to his 'sperience, I'll tuck you up when I git home and give you a hundred and fifty lashes, madam! see if I don't! Blessed Lord!' referring again to the Captain's relation, 'aint it a precious 'scourse?'"

The South has moved away from this condition—legally, if not altogether spiritually; and absolutely from the point of view contained in the following extract:

"No! but," ses the old man, 'they've got plenty of white servants at the North, what you can hire for little or nothing.'

"Goodness gracious!" ses old Miss Stallins; 'white servants! Well, the Lord knows I wouldn't have none of 'em 'bout me.'

"Nor me, neither," ses Mary. 'It may do well enuff for people what don't know the difference between niggers and white folks; but I could ne'er bear to see a white gall teatin' my chile about, and waitin' on me like a nigger. It would hurt my conscience to keep anybody 'bout

me in that condition who was as white and good as me.'

"But," ses Mr. Mountgomery, 'they're brung up to it.'

"Well," ses Mary, 'the more sin to them that brings 'em up to be servants. A servant, to be any account as a servant, has got to have a different kind of a spirit from other people; and anybody that would make a nigger of a white chile because it was pore, han't no Christian principles in 'em.'

The survivals at the South of the social life depicted in this book are probably more numerous than any one imagines, though their range is constantly narrowing. We shall point to one which has been much discussed of late in our columns, and for which many explanations have been offered, "the war" and "reconstruction" included. The Southern testimony about to be cited is taken from the chapter on "Flush Times," the period in question being about the year 1836. The statement is general for the Southwest, and the italics are the author's (p. 104):

"Occasionally the scene was diversified by a murder or two, which, though perpetrated from behind a corner, or behind the back of the deceased, whenever the accused *chese* to stand his trial, was always found to be committed in self-defence, securing the homicide an honorable acquittal at the hands of his peers."

We should be misrepresenting 'Oddities in Southern Life' if we conveyed the impression that its seriousness was greater than its drollery. The reverse is the case.

How to Succeed: In Public Life, as a Minister, as a Physician, as a Musician, as an Engineer, as an Artist, in Mercantile Life, as a Farmer, as an Inventor, and in Literature. A Series of Essays by Senators Bayard and Edmunds; Drs. John Hall, Willard Parker, and Leopold Damrosch; Gen. Wm. Sooy Smith, W. Hamilton Gibson, Lawson Valentine, Commissioner Geo. B. Loring, Thomas Edison, E. P. Roe, and Lyman Abbott. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D. [Handy-Book Series, No. 26.] G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1882.

The title of this handbook, on the subject of success in life, gives a fair idea of its contents. Considering, however, the interest of the subject, the volume is rather disappointing. A great deal of it consists of moral advice, of a sort which children get in the nursery and in church (many of the articles first appeared in the *Christian Union*); and a critic may fairly suggest that success in life is not usually among moralists regarded as a safe motive for compliance with the moral law. The world is full of successful men who are by no means examples of a strict attention to duty, but, on the contrary, neglect many plain duties altogether. Dr. Abbott and many of his contributors do not seem to be aware that in each profession or occupation there are special virtues which lead to success, and, at the same time, vices which do not seriously interfere with, or which even aid, it. A man may make a great success as an advocate, for instance, and be a complete spendthrift; Webster and many other lawyers are instances of this. Again, a man may succeed in the dry-goods business, and yet be mean, ignorant, and unjust to his family. A man may succeed as a quack through the aid of stupendous lying. The only reply that can be made to this is that these are not cases of "true success," or "Christian success"; and Dr. Abbott seems to vacillate between this view of the matter and a belief that a real Christian will always obtain a complete worldly success. To show that we do him no injustice in saying this, we may quote one or two of his remarks: "The precepts of the New

Testament are good as social, business, and political principles"; "There is no chart of sailing directions so good to steer by for the port of success as those to be gathered from the instructions of Jesus of Nazareth"; "The golden rule is a good rule to do business by." In other words, worldly prudence teaches us the same lesson as the Gospel. This is queer doctrine to hear from a minister, and it is not surprising to find Mr. Bayard, in his contribution on public life, insisting that obedience to "duty," rather than the attainment of success, is what ought to be held up to young Americans. Christianity was certainly not preached by Christ as a good "paying" or "business" faith; indeed, from a worldly point of view, the career of the founder of the faith and his immediate disciples cannot be regarded as successful at all.

An Illustrated Dictionary of Words Used in Art and Archaeology. By J. W. Mollett. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1882. Pp. 350.

This is a handy and useful but badly edited book. Its genesis reminds one of the jack-knife which first had its blades replaced and then its handle. It was begun as an amended edition of the dictionary composed by a French architect, M. Ernest Bosc; but, while his 450 engravings have been retained and added to, "little or nothing of the text has been left standing." Terms of architecture, painting, engraving, military science, and antiquities; the names of garments, of ceramic wares, of woods, of stones, of musical instruments, of heraldry, etc., etc., constitute the bulk of the present work. Sometimes, as under *Etching* and *Wood engraving*, there is, besides the mere definition, some account of processes. In general, however, the notices are very brief.

The want of consistency is the most striking feature of this dictionary, which could not, of course, be exhaustive. Typography is not ostensibly included in the editor's scheme; then why insert *Plen* type, and omit *bourgeois*, *brevier*, *nonpareil*, and the rest? Music is likewise not professedly regarded; yet we find *Largo*, with the definition: "a slow movement, one degree quicker than *adagio*." But what does *adagio* mean? It will be sought for in vain under *A*, as will also *andante* and *allegro*, and we have discovered no other corresponding term. So we have *Clef*, but no staff. Astronomy, again, is out of range; still, here is *Perigee* without *apogee*, and *Perihelion* without *aphelion*. Similarly, *Heliochromy* is admitted, but not *heliotype*, and but a small and arbitrary number of the various photo-engraving processes. *Millstone-grit*, "the name of a good building-stone, plentiful in the north of England," is thought worthy of a place beside marble, porphyry, etc., but granite and sandstone are overlooked. A different sort of partiality is shown in giving a separate entry to *Victoria Cross*, and to but one other of the varieties mentioned under the general title, *Cross*.

The vagueness of the "archæology" contemplated by the editor gives rise to many ludicrous surprises as well as unaccountable omissions. We can easily count on our two hands all the vulgar names of flowers we have encountered in searching these pages. The field is one which, in our opinion, should have been avoided; but having strayed into it, ought Mr. Mollett to have slighted, say, jack-in-the-pulpit or dead-men's-fingers in order to explain *Love lies bleeding* and a very few others? The climax is perhaps reached in "*Dog's-nose*: a cordial used in low life," which no one in the wide world, we venture to say, would have dreamed of looking for in a "Dictionary of Art and Archaeology." Sack, by the way, is not recognized. It seems, on the

other hand, a poor tribute to the intelligence of the reader that he should need a definition of *Bower* in its older sense. But what, then, shall be said of volunteering information about *Epoch*, *Knapsack*, *Oasis*, *Opacity*, or of inserting *Figure paintings* only to define them as "paintings of the human figure"?

These defects in plan and execution are far from depriving this dictionary of all utility. They will as often amuse as disappoint. The illustrations are numerous and extremely good, but space would have been gained by not repeating them, though this practice has its convenience. That the common frog, apart from any artistic or archaeological association, should have been depicted (p. 147), is only another instance of the freakishness which we have already exemplified.

The Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss, author of 'Stepping Heavenward.' New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

No one can read with indifference the story of a life so singularly fortunate in its opportunities as that of Mrs. Prentiss, and no one can read without profit the record of her beautiful and untiring use of those opportunities. The letters and journals have something of the exquisite sweetness of Eugénie de Guérin's. And why should they not? 'The City of God' and the 'Imitation' were daily food alike to Calvinist

and Romanist. Both read long and often from Fénelon, and what the one found in the 'Sacra Privata' and the 'Christian Year,' the other sought in the 'Lives of the Saints' and the 'Month of Mary.' Each life, in its piety, bears witness to the essential oneness of Christian faith—the living as seeing the invisible.

Mrs. Prentiss's books are not likely to be forgotten. Their simplicity and their truth to the types she chose to portray place them far above the majority of the Sunday-school books among which they belong. She had a reality about her, a sense of the fitness of things, which kept her safe alike from platitudes and from morbid exaggerations. She might have succeeded in other fields of literature, though her own single-eyed, religious, yet always most humble, purpose could never have admitted them as higher or wider. The little book, 'The Story that Lizzie Told,' a sketch of the flower-fête of the poor children in the Dean's garden at Westminster, shows what her power could have been.

A smaller volume than the present biography might have reached a greater number of general readers, but in the circles for which it was especially intended there will not be a page too many. As to plan and execution, it is not too much to say that it is faultless.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, Mary. An Honorable Surrender. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.

Henry Holt &

PUBLISH

A NEW LEISURE HOUR NOVEL.

GERALDINE HAWTHORNE.
By B. M. Butt, author of 'Miss Molly.' 16mo, \$1.

GOSSE'S ON VIOL and FLUTE.
Selected Poems. By Edmond W. Gosse. Sq. 12mo, \$1 75.

EVOLUTION and CHRISTIANITY. By J. F. Yorke. 12mo, \$1 50.

SIBYLLINE LEAVES. By A. E. M. K. 16mo, cloth, gilt, \$2.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

THE FACTORS OF CIVILIZATION.
Real and Assumed. 8vo, demy, 358 pages, tinted paper, handsomely bound in cloth, price \$2. Usual discount to the trade.

"A curious and significant book."—*Chicago Times*.
Ref.: German Bank of Little Rock, Ark., and Atlanta National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.
Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price. Address
J. H. BAILEY, 128 S. Pryor St., Atlanta, Ga.

THE LOST TRIBES OF ISRAEL
In England and America. The Scriptural Argument. Price 25 cents. Address GEO. W. GREENWOOD, 296 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE CHICKERING PIANO

"THE BEST IN THE WORLD."

Before buying elsewhere, write for circular and price list to

CHICKERING & SONS,
CHICKERING HALL, MANUFACTORY,
130 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. | 156 Tremont St., Boston

A General Index to the Nation.

From July, 1865, to September, 1890.

Net price (no trade discount), \$2 50. Purchasers will please remit with order. Address Publisher of the Nation, Box 794, New York, or Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine.

MISSOURI TRUST CO.

—safest securities in the market. Also makes

Per Cent.

Farm Loans, secured by DEED OF TRUST, being a first lien upon the property. Interest payable semi-annually at the CHEMICAL NATIONAL BANK, N. Y. Collection laws effective and speedy. Safety proved by ten years' experience. For full particulars and references address

O. A. CRANDALL, President,
Sedalia, Mo.

PRINCE & WHITELY,

No. 64 Broadway, New York.
(Branch Office, 180 Fifth Avenue.)
All classes of Railway and Mining Stocks bought and sold on Commission.
Private telegraph-wires to Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, Washington, Boston, Bridgeport, and New Haven.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.,

59 WALL STREET,
ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS
For use in
THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

KIDDER, PEABODY & CO.,

1 Nassau St., N. Y.; 113 Devonshire St., Boston.
EXCHANGE AND LETTERS OF CREDIT ON GREAT BRITAIN AND THE CONTINENT.

Correspondents:
BARING BROTHERS & CO., London;
PERIER FRERES & CO., Paris;
MENDELSSOHN & CO., Berlin.

A. P. TURNER & CO.,

207 WALNUT PLACE, PHILADELPHIA,
DEALERS IN RAILWAY BONDS.
Orders executed at all the exchanges. Correspondence solicited.

DAKOTA.—LOANS AND INVESTMENTS.—Loans effected on first-class security. Investments in farming lands and city property made and attended to. Highest references given.
Address
HAIGHT & LITTLE, Attorneys, Bismarck, D. T.

8 Per Cent. First Mortgages.

Large security. Something new. Send for circular.
FRANCIS SMITH & CO., Indianapolis, Ind.

FIRST MORTGAGE LOANS

placed on well-improved Kansas City property. For rates and references address
HOMER REED, Kansas City, Mo.

A Kempis, Thomas. Of the Imitation of Christ. Parchment edition. D. Appleton & Co. \$1 25.
Amos, Prof. S. The Science of Politics. D. Appleton & Co. \$1 75.
Baring-Gould, S. The Vicar of Morwenstow. Fourth Am. edition. F. Whittaker. \$1 25.
Bolles, Prof. A. S. The Financial History of the United States from 1789 to 1890. D. Appleton & Co. \$3 50.
Butt, Beatrice May. Geraldine Hawthorne. New York: Henry Holt & Co. \$1.
Cooke, J. E. The Virginia Comedians; or, Old Days in the Old Dominion. D. Appleton & Co. \$1 25.
Cooper, Peter. Ideas for a Science of Good Government: Addresses, Letters, and Articles. Trow's Printing Co.
Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson. 1834-1872. 2 vols. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co.
Davis, I. P. Hygiene for Girls. D. Appleton & Co. \$1 25.
"Dex Aie." Revised and Reprinted from the Paris edition of 1881. New York.
Eaton, D. C. Greek Culture. Selections from Friedrich's Bausteine. Parts 1, 2, 3. New Haven.
Field, H. M. On the Desert: with a Brief Review of Recent Events in Egypt. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.
Graham, H. G. Rousseau. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.
Hawes, Rev. H. R. American Humorists. Funk & Wagnalls. 15 cents.
Hawthorne, N. A Wonder Book. Tanglewood Tales and Grandfather's Chair. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$2.
Hawthorne, N. The House of the Seven Gables, and the Snow Image, and Twice-Told Tales. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$2.
Hawthorne, J. Dust: a Novel. Fordis, Howard & Hubert. \$1 25.
Hay, Mary Cecil. Bid Me Discourse. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 10 cents.
Hutton, J. James and Philip Van Artevelde. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
James, W. P. Guesses at Purpose in Nature, with Especial Reference to Plants. E. & J. B. Young. 60 cents.
James, H., Jr. The Siege of London, the Pension Beaurepas, and the Point of View. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co.
Lowell Birthday Book. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.
Martin and Moale. Handbook of Vertebrate Dissection. Part 2. How to Dissect a Bird. Macmillan & Co. 60 cts.
Muzzey, A. B. Reminiscences and Memorials of Men of the Revolution and their Families. Boston: Estes & Lauriat.

New England Mutual

LIFE INSURANCE CO.,

BOSTON, MASS.

Statement of Business for 1882.

Assets..... \$16,128,265 94

RECEIPTS.

For Premiums.....	\$1,824,587 77
For Interest and Rents, less taxes.....	784,678 83
Balance of Profit and Loss Account.....	20,487 56
Total.....	\$2,629,754 16
	\$18,758,020 10

DISBURSEMENTS.

Death Claims.....	\$1,004,869 00
Matured and Discounted Endowments.....	333,914 00
Cancelled and Surrendered Policies.....	134,500 67
Distribution of Surplus....	516,903 99

Total paid to Policy Holders.....	\$1,990,187 66
Commissions to Agents....	130,305 66
Salaries, Medical Fees, and Advertising.....	103,102 67
Printing, stationery, and all other incidental expenses at Home Office and Agencies.....	99,782 41
Interest paid for Premium on Investments and accrued interest thereon....	2,399 85
	2,325,838 25
	\$16,432,181 85

LIABILITIES.

Reserve at 4 per cent., Mass. standard.....	\$13,045,165 56
Balance Distributions unpaid.....	78,765 06
Death and Endowment Claims unpaid.....	140,959 00
Surplus, Mass. standard, 4 per cent.....	\$2,567,292 23

BENJ. F. STEVENS, President.

JOS. M. GIBBENS, Secretary.

KENNY & RATCLIFFE,

GENERAL AGENTS,

208 Broadway, New York.

MORTGAGE LOANS negotiated on New Orleans property. 8 per cent. guaranteed. Address FERGUS KERNAN, Att'y-at-Law, 22 Carondelet, N. O.

WANTED—Bank in Bayfield, Wis. Fine opening, with capital from fifty to one hundred thousand. Address all communications to R. D. PIKE, care First National Bank, Chicago.

